THE ANTI-JACOBIN Review and Magazine;

&c. &c. &c.

For FEBRUARY, 1801.

Si iſtis ad maledicendum diſertis et eloquentibus eſſe licet, nos, in optimâ noſtrâ cauſâ, ad verè reſpondendum haud ſanè convenit eſſe mutos.

Juelli. Apol.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

The Hiſtory of the Campaign of 1799, *in Holland. Tranſlated from the French.* 8vo. Pp. 496. 15s. Cadell and Davies. 1801.

THIS forms the fifth and laſt volume of the military hiſtory of the war from the beginning of the campaign of 1796 to the cloſe of that of 1799. It is compoſed with the ſame ability, the ſame ſcrupulous attention to facts, and the ſame rigid impartiality, which ſo eminently diſtinguiſhed the former volumes. It contains, beyond compariſon, the beſt, and, indeed, the only complete and ſatisfactory account of the Expedition to Holland, which has hitherto appeared in Europe. The author has, evidently, had acceſs to the moſt authentic ſources of information, and he has availed himſelf of them with equal judgment and ſkill: the military operations, in which the troops of this country took ſo decided and ſo diſtinguiſhed a part, are detailed in a manner at once the moſt perſpicuous and the moſt ſcientific, ſo as to afford the fulleſt information to the common reader, and the higheſt ſatisfaction to the profeſſional ſtudent. The end and object of the Expedition are clearly and forcibly explained, and ably reſcued from the imputations of ignorance, and the perverſions of malice. Here, as before, the author has rendered a public ſervice by ex-

poſing the faithleſs accounts and wanton fabrications of the French; and the groſs errors and wilful miſrepreſentations of different writers; among others, of General Dumas, the author of the *Précis des Evenemens Militaires* (now belonging to the French Staff) whoſe publication has acquired much more credit than it deſerves. As the remarkable action of the 19th of September, which may be truly ſaid to have decided the fate of the Expedition, has been an object of more general diſcuſſion in Europe than any other, and has been the ground of more recrimination between the Ruſſians and the Engliſh, we ſhall ſelect the author's account of it, as being peculiarly intereſting in itſelf, and as affording a fair ſpecimen of the attention which he has paid to every part of the ſubject.

"It had been ordered that the attack ſhould begin on all ſides at break of day, but nearly two hours before that time the Ruſſian Major General Southoff with his chaſſeurs and a battalion of grenadiers, which formed the advanced guard, paſſed the canal in front of Petten, and advanced towards Camperduyn. Whether he thought it indiſpenſably neceſſary to ſupport General Southoff, or that he partook of his impatience and that of his troops, General Herman an hour after cauſed the canal to be paſſed by the firſt line of his corps, and marched to the attack of the enemies' entrenchments upon the Slaperdike. Although it was not yet light, the firſt Ruſſian battalion advanced with the greateſt boldneſs in column of diviſions, and carried a traverſe which the enemy had conſtructed on the dike. The latter ſtill occupied a ſmall work on the extremity of the dike which covered in part the entrance of the village of Groet, where they had a piece of cannon. The grenadiers, followed by the remainder of the firſt line, puſhed on without ſtopping to the end of the dike, and with the ſame impetuoſity carried the work and the piece of cannon. The French ſurpriſed by the vivacity of this attack oppoſed in front a ſlight reſiſtance, and fell back towards their right. The Ruſſians ſuffered little from their fire, but much from their own; the obſcurity being ſuch that nothing could be diſtinguiſhed. The chaſſeurs of the advanced guard, ſeveral of whom found great difficulty in extricating themſelves from the marſhy ground, which lies between the ſea dike and the Slaperdike, alſo directed their fire towards the ground which was already occupied by their firſt line. The ſoldiers clamorouſly called for the ſupport of their artillery, although it was impoſſible to direct its fire upon any diſtinct object, and it naturally did more harm than good. Part of the Ruſſians upon quitting the Slaperdike, proceeded in a very cloſe column, nd with very little order upon the road under the Sand-hills, wh ch leads through the village of Groet, while the reſt filed to the right among the ſand-hills of which they never covered the whole extent, becauſe the advanced guard, which was to march along the ſtrand, in the dark confounded itſelf with the firſt line, with which it continued mixed

the

the whole day. The firſt of theſe corps took no precautions to ſecure its left flank, nor the ſecond its right flank. That which marched along the road, advanced rapidly, but in great confuſion and without forming or preſerving any order: it ſoon reached Groet, carried that village eaſily, and continued its progreſs. The French troops, which were in the village, not having time to fall back quick enough to join thoſe who were attacked in front, probably apprehenſive of being cut off, had thrown themſelves upon the left flank, where without being further noticed by the Ruſſians, they diſperſed as *tirailleurs* in the encloſures, the hedges, and the ditches; and the latter ſuffered ſeverely both from their fire and from that of their own friends in the Sand-hills, who, although in fact rather behind them, nevertheleſs directed their fire in part to the left.

"Unfortunately, immediately after the attack of the village of Groet, where his horſe had been wounded, General Herman with the greateſt part of his ſtaff had gone into the Sand-hills; and no officer who was particularly entruſted with the direction of its movements remained with the column, which followed the road, crouded by the troops, which, fatigued with marching in the Sand-hills, left them whenever a natural interval or a path enabled them to ſeek for more eaſy ground. As ſoon as the village of Groet was taken, Lieutenant-General Herman had ordered the ſecond line to advance under the orders of Major-General Arbeneff; but this line in oppoſition to his orders, either from its own impatience or the nature of the ground, inſtead of forming a reſerve to ſupport the firſt, ſoon mixed with it, and completed the confuſion. The Britiſh brigade of Major-General Manners, with the 7th regiment of dragoons and the horſe artillery, which according to the orders of General Herman were to follow this ſecond line, were much retarded by the march of the Imperial troops, which from marching in column neceſſarily employed much time in filing off, and occupied almoſt the whole extent of the road. When at laſt that brigade was enabled to quit the Slaperdike, it directed itſelf to the left, and was ſoon engaged with that part of the enemy's corps, which had remained upon the flank of the Ruſſian column. Major-General Manners repulſed them; and as they retreated to Schoreldam, he was induced to take the ſame direction.

"During this time the Ruſſians puſhing on without heſitation, arrived at the village of Schorel, attacked it with the ſame bravery they had done that of Groet, carried it with the ſame facility, and marched towards Bergen; their ardour not being at all abated, nor their progreſs checked by the ſevere loſs which they experienced. About a mile from Bergen begins an avenue of trees, which continues nearly in the ſame direction, until it reaches the Sand-hills above the village where it turns ſhort to the left and leads in a ſtraight line to it. A number of houſes are ſcattered on each ſide of this avenue; and at about 300 paces from Bergen the ground opens conſiderably to the left. The French had placed, at about 800 paces from the avenue, a battery of ſeveral pieces of cannon, which was protected by a line of cavalry mixed with ſome infantry. The encloſures here were more

frequent and woody than at the beginning of the avenue, and were lined on the right and left with *tirailleurs*; so that when the Ruſſians reached this point they found themſelves expoſed at once to the fire on their flanks, to that from Bergen in front, and to that of the battery which was likewiſe directed upon the head of the column—Stopped for a moment by the deſtructive effect of this fire, and by the appearance of the French upon their flank, the Ruſſians loudly called for their artillery, which there was great difficulty in bringing up, owing to the ſandy nature of the ground, the rapidity of the march which had fatigued the horſes, and the confuſed maſs which obſtructed the road. The fire of the cannon checked the French who were advancing on their left; and the Ruſſians again puſhed forward.—At this period of the action General Eſſen reached the head of the column and immediately ordered the troops to halt and form—two pieces of cannon were placed at the above mentioned opening, and another upon the road leading to Bergen. A battalion was ſent into the fields to the left of the road; but the ſame precaution was not taken to cover the right; and the remainder of the troops proceeded in their march to Bergen. The column continued to be encreaſed by a number of men who quitted the Sand-hills, and it was at laſt joined by Lieutenant-General Herman, who alſo having hitherto been engaged there, was ignorant of what had been paſſing on the left. This brave officer was received with marks of joy by the ſoldiers who adored him; but nevertheleſs it was in vain that he uſed every effort to reſtore order among them: they ſeemed to be deaf to his voice and no longer to acknowledge his authority; and the fire of the enemy having in the mean time obliged the battalion placed on the left to fall back into the avenue, the confuſion became as great as ever. In the interval the head of the column arrived about eight in the morning at Bergen, penetrated into and took poſſeſſion of it. The troops being then protected by the houſes on the right, and continuing expoſed to the fire of the French only in front and on the left, the Ruſſian General ſucceeded in forming a battalion of fuſileers in front of the church almoſt oppoſite to the canal, and another of grenadiers in a ſtreet a little on the right of the church. The reſt of the troops were diſtributed between the houſes and in the openings of the different avenues leading to the centre of the village. Such were the haſty diſpoſitions of General Herman to endeavour to keep the long but narrow extent of ground of which the poſſeſſion had been ſo rapidly gained, until it ſhould be poſſible for the brigade of General Manners and for the column of General Dundas to come up to his aſſiſtance.

"The march, or rather the rapid and irregular progreſs of the Ruſſians, had, as may be imagined, ſurpriſed and diſconcerted the French. Driven from poſt to poſt with an impetuoſity which did not give them time for recollection, they had ſcattered themſelves, as has been obſerved, on both ſides of the road, leſs perhaps from deſign than from inſtinct, and leſs becauſe it was the beſt than becauſe it was the thing moſt eaſy to be done. Thus they had ſuffered that impetuous torrent to paſs before them. Generals Brune and Vandamme ſeeing

ing the left of their position pierced in all its depth, and the rear of their centre outflanked, and having reason to fear that in the end their line might be entirely turned and cut off if they allowed the English time to support the Russians, had brought up their reserve from Alkmaar with all possible haste, and had likewise drawn from the Koedike a detachment of the division of General Dumonceau. A part of these troops were directed towards the Sand-hills, and the rest joined those near Bergen. As soon as these reinforcements were arrived at their destination the Republicans marched to the attack of the two Russian columns. That which was in the Sand-hills, and which till then had not ceased to advance with the same quickness and the same confusion as that upon the left, found itself turned by a corps of the enemy which marched along the shore. Being in very little order and having expended its ammunition, it fell back, and the French advanced between it and the column of the left which had crouded into Bergen. The latter column, which, for 20 minutes, had been exposed to the most violent fire of cannon and musquetry, now saw itself threatened in the rear, while on the left the enemy was penetrating by the opening into the avenue. To secure that important point General Herman immediately sent there the battalion of fusileers which he had formed in front of the church; but the Republicans soon surrounded the village under cover of a very severe fire from their artillery which could not be returned; for out of three pieces of cannon which the Russians had, two were without ammunition: the third, which was placed at the entry of the village towards the Koedike, did not stop the enemy, who got possession of it and penetrated from that side into the village: General Herman, who had just gone from the church-yard to the troops upon the right, was cut off and taken prisoner with a part of his corps after making a most vigorous resistance near the castle of Bergen, from which he endeavoured in vain to effect his retreat across the Sand-hills. Major-General Essen, whom he had left near the church, taking advantage of this circumstance, which occupied the enemy, collected as many of his men as he could and forced his way through the avenue to the Sand-hills, from which the French troops retired at his approach, and upon the ridge of which he succeeded in some measure in forming his men. After having halted there for a short time he continued his retreat towards Schorel.

"Such was the event of the attack on the right, and the unfortunate consequence of the inconsiderate and improvident bravery of the Russians. As the operations of this column had a great effect upon the fate of this day, and it may even be said upon that of the whole campaign, and as they have as yet been but imperfectly related, it has been thought proper in this place to give a very complete detail of them."

The conduct of the Russians, under General Essen, in a subsequent engagement on the 2d of October, was the very reverse of what it was on the 19th of September, and, in each case, it was equally fatal to the cause, in which they were sent to co-operate.

The following inſtances of moſt flagrant attempts to impoſe on the credulous multitude on the Continent of Europe, by the moſt impudent falſhoods, both by the Dutch and French Republican Commanders, cannot be too generally known.

" In the relation which General Daendels has given of this action, he ſays, ' that the Engliſh yielded with the greateſt precipitation to the attack of his grenadiers, when he returned into Oudeſcarſpel; that he took there 100 priſoners and two pieces of cannon belonging to the Engliſh, beſides retaking his own, &c. &c.' All this is abſolutely falſe: General Daendels did not recover the village by open force, nor even attack it. The Engliſh evacuated it in conſequence of the orders they had received, without a ſingle ſhot being fired, and without the Dutch even making their appearance. Twenty-eight men too ſeverely wounded to be tranſported, were obliged to be left in it; all the Engliſh cannon were carried off, and thoſe taken from the enemy, as has been ſaid, were thrown into the canals, their carriages and ammunition being deſtroyed. The loſs of the column of Sir James Pulteney was 38 men killed, 174 wounded, and 28 miſſing, in all 240 including 21 officers. The Dutch General however has not heſitated to ſay, that the Engliſh left 500 dead upon the field. In other reſpects the recital of Daendels is very correct, and on the whole much better drawn up than that which he made of the affair of the 27th of Auguſt.

" In the report which Gen. Brune made at the times of this action he ſaid, ' that the Allies loſt more than 3,000 men in killed and wounded, 2,000 priſoners, and 25 pieces of cannon, that General Eſſen had been ſeverely wounded, and the Engliſh General Knox killed.' Meaning doubtleſs to give to their ſtory a greater appearance of truth, he ſaid afterwards, ' that his loss conſiſted in 50 killed and 300 wounded.' Luckily he added, ' *this will appear incredible* :'— all the world was certainly of his mind with regard to this laſt point.

" In the ſame report it is ſtated, ' *the Anglo-Ruſſians committed the greateſt exceſſes in the villages which they occupied during the action; the poor Batavian peaſants were maſſacred and burnt in their houſes with women and children; ſeveral villages are ſtill on fire, and the Engliſh in particular diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their cruelty.*' It is the duty of an hiſtorian to contradict imputations which are as falſe as they are ſerious. Three villages it is true were burnt, Schorel, Schoreldam, and Crabbendam. The firſt was ſet on fire by howitzers during the action: but if this is a ſubject of regret, it certainly is not one of reproach. Schoreldam was ſet on fire by the fire of the French during the time the Engliſh were in poſſeſſion of it, and the accident was diſadvantageous to the latter; but at the ſame time it would be unjuſt to attribute it to the former as a crime. Crabbendam was intentionally burnt by the Engliſh in the evening of the 19th, becauſe, as we may be convinced by turning our eyes to the map, this village was much too near to their poſition, and might have covered the approach and greatly favoured the attack of the enemy in this part.

The

The Engliſh acted upon this occaſion upon the ſame principle, and are entitled to the ſame excuſe as the commander of a fortreſs who deſtroys the ſuburbs, and who would be militarily inexcuſable if he did not do it. The author believes that the inhabitants of Crabbendam were indemnified.

" As to the cruelties which General Brune imputes to the Engliſh, the author can affirm that no act of this kind nor any pillage was committed in the villages into which they entered, ſuch as the Langedike, Warmenhuyſen, Schoreldam, and all that part of the country over which the corps of General Abercromby marched. On the right the troops were ſo mixed, and the villages were ſo often taken and retaken, that probably ſome exceſſes were committed in the heat of action. But it is probable, that the blame attaches as much to the French as to the Ruſſians."

In the concluding chapter a maſterly review of the campaign is given, and the conduct of the Commander in Chief, in the execution of the plan, as well as that of the authors of it in projecting it, is fully juſtified. The following accurate eſtimate of the loſs of the Allies moſt effectually remove all doubts, and ſilence all clamour on that head.

" In recapitulating the loſs of the Engliſh in the five different actions, it will appear that the total of officers and ſoldiers killed, amounted to 540; of wounded 2,761; and of miſſing 1,340. Upon calculations made, and on which we believe we can rely, only one man in 70 of the wounded died. The whole then of thoſe killed on the field of battle, or who died of their wounds, is 579, that is to ſay, much leſs than have been loſt in a ſingle action, more than forty times in the courſe of the war. With reſpect to priſoners, as always happens, a great number of thoſe put down as ſuch in the returns made immediately after the action, returned to their colours.

" The Ruſſians landed 17,000 men: nearly 15,000, including the wounded, re-imbarked. They loſt then very little more than 2,000 men in killed and priſoners. We ſee, therefore, that the loſs of the Allies in both theſe reſpects did not exceed 4,000; and from information received, we have reaſon to believe, that the loſs of the enemy of the ſame deſcription was not leſs. The author has already in the preceding volumes had occaſion to ſhew how much ſmaller (happily for humanity) the number of men killed in war is, than the haſty eſtimates of the public and of gazetteers repreſent them to be."

There are four large and moſt accurate maps of the theatre of war annexed to the book, with an appendix containing all the official documents, including ſome never before publiſhed. The tranſlation is, in general, correct, though ſome few galliciſms occaſionally occur, particularly in rendering into Engliſh the compound paſt tenſes of French verbs; an error common to all tranſlators, with very few exceptions indeed.

Addreſs of the Aſſociate Synod, to the People under their charge, reſpecting the preſent Difference on the Subject of the Preamble to the Formula. 8vo. Pp. 27. 4d. Pillans. Edinburgh. 1799.

The New Light Examined; or, Obſervations on the Proceedings of the Aſſociate Synod, againſt their own Standards. By William Porteous, D. D. 8vo. Pp. 56. Glaſgow. Printed by D. Niven. 1800.

A Defence of the Aſſociate Synod, againſt the Charge of Sedition, addreſſed to W. Porteous, D. D. By James Peddie, Miniſter of the Aſſociate Congregation of Briſto-Street, Edinburgh. 8vo. Pp. 78. Edinburgh. Printed by J. Ritchee. 1800.

IN order to enable ourſelves to judge of the merit, views, and tendency of theſe three pamphlets, we have taken the trouble to enquire into the hiſtory of the ſect to which they refer. As this hiſtory will be new to moſt of our readers on this ſide of the Tweed, and is neceſſary to make the pamphlets intelligible, we will give it as fairly and diſtinctly as we can.

From the eſtabliſhment of Preſbytery in Scotland, ſoon after the revolution to the year 1732, all the Preſbyterians were members of the eſtabliſhed church. They acknowledged the Weſtminſter confeſſion of Faith as the ſtandard which contained the doctrines of their creed, and preſcribed their rules and forms in church government. The election of Miniſters to vacant charges which, on the charge of the conſtitution of the national church, had been lodged in the hands of the heritors of the pariſh, and elders of the Kirk ſeſſion * was, in 1712, aboliſhed by act of Parliament, and beſtowed upon thoſe patrons who had formerly exerciſed that privilege. Patronage

* The Kirk ſeſſion is a court compoſed of the miniſter of the pariſh, and a number of laymen called elders and deacons. The office of the elders, in many reſpects, reſembles that of our church-wardens; but the elder has a kind of ſpiritual juriſdiction over his portion of the pariſh, which the church-warden has not. We believe he has a right to inſpect the morals of the people, and to make his report to the miniſter and other elders aſſembled in ſeſſion; and by the vote of the majority it is decided whether the perſon accuſed is to be admitted to the Lord's ſupper or repelled from it. If we be not miſinformed, the miniſter has no vote in the deciſion of theſe queſtions except when the lay-elders are equally divided in opinion. We do

tronage after this period was often complained of in Scotland as a grievance; but no formal oppoſition was made to it till the year 1732. In that year a petition was preſented againſt it to the General Aſſembly of the Church ſubſcribed by more than forty clergymen. But the Aſſembly having no authority to repeal or alter a law made by the Parliament of Great Britain, rejected the petition. This conduct of the Aſſembly gave great offence. It was aſſerted that patronage deprived many individuals of their natural right to chooſe their own paſtors; that it was prejudicial to the honour of the church, to the edification of the people, and contrary to the appointment of Jeſus Chriſt, and the practice of the Apoſtles. Abſurd as theſe opinions muſt appear to all who have ſtudied the Scriptures and the hiſtory of the church, one man appeared who was bold enough to attack the Aſſembly in an open and violent manner for not perceiving their truth. This was Ebenezer Erſkine, one of the miniſters of Stirling. In a ſermon, which he preached in 1732, at the opening of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, he inveighed againſt the conduct of the General Aſſembly, and alleged that it was contrary to the word of God, and to the conſtitution of the church. This public attack on the ſupreme judicatory of the church naturally excited the indignation of the Synod; they ordered Mr. Erſkine to be rebuked and admoniſhed from the chair. Againſt this ſentence he proteſted, and appealed to the next General Aſſembly, which was to meet in May, 1733. The General Aſſembly affirmed the ſentence of the Synod; but, inſtead of ſubmitting to it, Mr. Erſkine acted in a very extraordinary manner. He proteſted againſt the conduct of the General Aſſembly, from which there can be no appeal to any court upon earth, and declared that as his conduct was agreeable to the word of God, and the ſtandards of the church, he would ſtill conſider himſelf as at liberty to preach the ſame truths on every proper occaſion. As this was direct diſobedience, and, indeed, offering open defiance to the authority of the church, had the Aſſembly immediately proceeded to ſuſpend Mr. Erſkine, they would have done nothing but what the honour and peace of the church required them to do. Inſtead of this, however, they acted with the moſt indulgent

---

do not preciſely know what are the powers of the Scotch deacons, but we believe that though they have a right to be preſent, they have no vote in the ſeſſion. Their office has certainly very little reſemblance to that of St. Stephen and St. Philip as ſtated in the Acts of the Apoſtles, or to the office of deacons in the church of England, and we are informed that they are generally uneducated men.

lenity.

lenity. They appointed a committee to confer with Mr. Erſkine, and three other clergymen who adhered to him, in order to prevail upon them to withdraw their proteſt. They refuſed to withdraw it. But the Aſſembly ſtill unwilling to puniſh them for diſobedience, gave them more than two months to conſider the matter; at the ſame time enjoining their commiſſion,* which was to meet in Auguſt following, to ſuſpend them from the exerciſe of their miniſtry, if they did not then comply. The commiſſion met, but the four clergymen were ſtill inflexible, and accordingly were ſuſpended, and cited to appear before the next meeting of the commiſſion in November. All this indulgence rendered them more obſtinate. They were, therefore, removed from their reſpective charges, and their churches declared vacant. They now proteſted that their miniſterial office ſhould be held as valid, as if no ſuch ſentence had paſſed, and that though they were obliged to make *a ſeceſſion* from the prevailing party in the church courts, they would ſtill continue to preach the goſpel according to the word of God, and the eſtabliſhed principles of the church of Scotland. Thus, it appears that Mr. Ebenezer Erſkine, and his adherents, conſidered themſelves as the true church, who were obliged to abandon the corrupted Babylon, which was now required by an act of parliament to oppoſe the word of God, and the rules which itſelf, in its pureſt ſtate, had wiſely adopted!

Notwithſtanding the very diſreſpectful and rebellious conduct of thoſe clergymen who had ſeceded, the General Aſſembly, which met in May, 1734, diſplayed a degree of clemency, perhaps unparalleled in eccleſiaſtical courts. They empowered the Synod of Perth and Stirling, to receive the ejected miniſters into the church, and to reſtore them to their reſpective charges. But, becauſe the General Aſſembly had not thought it proper to acknowlege the injuſtice of their former deciſions, thoſe clergymen would not condeſcend to accept as a *favour* what they deemed themſelves entitled to demand as a *right*. They, therefore, ſpurned at the mild offers of the Aſſembly, erected for themſelves a new church under the guidance of what they termed the *Aſſociated Preſbytery*. They publiſhed, by way of manifeſto, what they called *an act, declaration, and teſtimony*, in favour of the doctrines and worſhip of the church of Scotland, and in oppoſition to the notorious defections, which learning and wiſdom had intro-

* By commiſſion is here meant a committee of the Aſſembly. The word in this ſenſe is, perhaps, not Engliſh; but we uſe the legal language of the church of Scotland.

duced.

duced. Hitherto they were only ſuſpended from the exerciſe of their functions; but for their contumacy they were, in 1740, ſolemnly degraded, or, in the eccleſiaſtical language of Scotland, depoſed from the holy miniſtry.

This depoſition they deſpiſed, and had even the addreſs, by pleading the merits of ſuffering, to convert it to their advantage: but in the year 1747, a grievous convulſion took place, which rent their infant ſociety into two parts. The inhabitants of Burghs, in Scotland, are obliged, upon certain occaſions, to take an oath by which they acknowlege the religion authorized by the laws of the kingdom, to be the true religion, and promiſe to defend it, and to renounce the Roman Catholic religion. About the true import of this oath, the ſeceders differed widely in opinion. One party contended that it contains nothing contrary to the principles upon which the ſeceſſion was made, and that every ſeceder may ſwear it with a ſafe conſcience; whilſt the other party affirmed that no ſeceder could ſwear it, without virtually renouncing his *act and teſtimony*. The former of theſe parties were called *burgher*, and the latter, *antiburgher* ſeceders; and each party, claiming to itſelf the lawful conſtitution of the *Aſſociate Synod*, the antiburghers, after ſeveral previous ſteps, excommunicated the burghers, and with great ſolemnity delivered them over to Satan!! Ever ſince this period the ſeceders have continued in ſeparate communions. Beſides their different views of the nature of the Burgheſs oath, they ſoon contrived to introduce other ſubjects of contention, to render the breach wider and wider. The Antiburghers having adopted different ideas from the Burghers with reſpect to what they call *covenanting*, renew, occaſionally, in their ſeveral congregations, the Scottiſh *national covenant*, and *the ſolemn league and covenant*; whilſt the Burghers, though they acknowlege covenanting to be a *moral duty*, and conſider the ſolemn vows of their anceſtors as obligatory on themſelves, have never renewed either of the two covenants ſince their ſeparation from their brethren, alledging that this is not the proper ſeaſon for engaging in ſuch a work! After this ſhort hiſtory of the ſeceders, which we give upon evidence, which no ſeceder we are ſure will deny, we are now prepared to examine the pamphlets to which our attention has been called by a reſpectable correſpondent. They relate to the Burgher ſeceders only; and the proceedings which gave occaſion to them, we trace back to May, 1795. A petition was then preſented to the Aſſociate Synod, by one Mr. Frazer, in which it was ſtated that their ſtandards taught doctrines reſpecting the power of the magiſtrate in matters of religion, which he was afraid ſome of their members did not believe.

In

In conſequence of the petition, an *Act of Forbearance*, as it was called, was propoſed, in which it was ſaid that "as the powers reſpecting religion, aſcribed to the civil magiſtrate in the confeſſion of faith, and larger catechiſm, as alſo in the national covenant of Scotland, and in the ſolemn league and covenant, has been, and ſtill is, matter of doubtful diſputation among good and faithful men, the Synod no longer make it a term of miniſterial or Chriſtian communion, but will exerciſe forbearance with brethren, whatever their ſentiments be upon this article." The ſame committee which had drawn up this act of forbearance, propoſed, alſo, a variety of alterations in the Formula which conſiſts of a liſt of queſtions, put to all candidates for ordination reſpecting their belief of the Scriptures, aſſent to the confeſſion of faith, &c. Theſe two propoſals, it is ſaid, much to the honour of the lay-ſeceders, excited ſuch a ſtrong oppoſition among them, that the Aſſociate Synod judged it prudent to forbear from urging their *Act of Forbearance*, and from making any changes upon their Formula.

At length a different plan occurred to the Aſſociate Synod. This was not to alter the Formula itſelf, but to put a preamble before it. It runs in theſe words—

"Whereas ſome parts of the ſtandard books of this Synod have been interpreted, as favouring compulſory meaſures in religion, the Synod hereby declare, that they do not require an approbation of any ſuch principle from any candidate for licence or ordination: and whereas a controverſy has ariſen among us, reſpecting the nature and kind of the obligation of our ſolemn covenants on poſterity, whether it be entirely of the ſame kind upon us, as upon our anceſtors who ſwore them, the Synod hereby declare, that while they hold the obligation of our covenants upon poſterity, they do not interfere with that controverſy which hath ariſen reſpecting the nature and kind of it, and recommend it to all their members to ſuppreſs that controverſy as tending to gender ſtrife rather than godly edifying."

The avowed intention of the Addreſs of the Aſſociate Synod (the firſt of the pamphlets before us) is to recommend this preamble, which it was thought would unite all parties. Accordingly the addreſs begins with bewailing the neceſſity which conſtrained their venerable predeceſſors to ſecede from the church of Scotland. They would not have withdrawn if they had been permitted to continue in the church without becoming partakers of her ſins. They hoped, and prayed, that the church would ſee her errors, and return to that purity of adminiſtration, from which her courts had departed; but they have waited in vain. The church of Scotland has obſtinately perſiſted in her defection till at length

no

no probability remains that they can ſoon return to her communion. They then congratulate themſelves on account of the great unanimity which has prevailed among them, except in one mournful inſtance (the diviſion into Burghers and Antiburghers.) But at length, they ſay, their ſky is overcaſt with black clouds, which threatens, as ſome think, to blaſt the beauty, and deſtroy the unity of the ſeceſſion church. (for ſo they are pleaſed to deſignate themſelves.) They bewail the decreaſe of brotherly love, acknowlege that a ſpirit of party has made its appearance, which is hoſtile to peace; they alſo complain much, that their meaſures have been miſrepreſented. They know that the great body of the Chriſtian people (their own hearers) are lovers of truth and peace, but they have been miſinformed reſpecting the principles and conduct of the Synod. They then proceed to ſtate the particulars of their conduct for the inſtruction of the Chriſtian people and their own vindication. They are ſurprized, that ſo ſmall a matter as the alteration of the Formula ſhould have produced any dread of innovation, as they ſay it has been frequently altered before. They then reply to the aſſertions which, they ſay, have been made, that the preamble was deviſed to conceal deſigns hoſtile to the ſtate. The appeal to their loyalty in their public prayers, and private life. The controverſy in which they are involved reſpects the power of the civil magiſtrate, but, ſay they, it is not a political, it is only an eccleſiaſtical, diſpute. The queſtion is, whether the ſtandard books of the Synod affirm that the magiſtrate ought to interfere with the deciſions of church courts, in matters which are purely eccleſiaſtical, and to compel men to be of the religious profeſſion of the ſtate. The Synod have been too cautious to attempt to determine the meaning of their ſtandards on theſe points; but they are not ſurprized, that many of their members are of opinion, that they give to the civil magiſtrate a power inconſiſtent with their doctrine elſewhere, reſpecting the headſhip of Chriſt, and the liberties of conſcience. They diſclaim, in the ſtrongeſt terms, all intolerant principles, which, they ſay, have been uniformly diſclaimed by every generation of ſeceders; though there are paſſages in their ſtandards, more particularly in the ſolemn league and covenant, which to ſome of the preſent generation ſeem to countenance ſuch principles. It is about the true meaning of theſe paſſages, that controverſies have riſen among them; and it was to put an end to thoſe controverſies, that the preamble was prefixed to the Formula, and that this authoritative address to their people was publiſhed.

If there were nothing to bring the principles of the Aſſociated

ciated Synod under ſuſpicion, but the preamble to the Formula, and this addreſs to the people under their charge, truth compels us to ſay that they would be at leaſt as much entitled to the confidence of the public, as the moſt orthodox and legal of their predeceſſors. Thinking, as we do, of that nefarious engagement, called *the ſolemn league and covenant*, which brought the virtuous Charles to the block, we are ſorry that the Aſſociated Synod has not renounced it wholly and explicitly; but if this was too bold a meaſure to be hazarded, it was certainly proper to diſclaim the authority of that ſanguinary clauſe, which obliges them to *extirpate* popery and prelacy from theſe kingdoms, and to bring to condign *puniſhment* all who ſhall oppoſe the covenant. It is, however, ridiculous to declare that the ſolemn vows and engagements of anceſtors are binding on their poſterity, and with the ſame breath refuſe to explain the nature of that obligation. Conſidered by itſelf ſuch language is, indeed, *only ridiculous*; but it deſerves to be branded with an epithet of much greater infamy, when thoſe who make uſe of it ſet themſelves free from *part of an undefined obligation which they acknowledge*. Men who can abſolve themſelves from *one* oath may abſolve themſelves from *every* oath of the ſame nature; and it does not appear from the pamphlet before us, that the members of the Aſſociate Synod conſider themſelves as more ſtrictly bound by their own oaths, than they are by the oaths of their anceſtors, which they have here dared to ſet aſide. The door which is thus opened for a breach of the moſt ſolemn engagements is very wide; and it certainly authorizes Dr. Porteous, more, perhaps, than his own reaſonings, to affirm that the Burgher ſeceders "are advancing boldly in the paths of innovation; that they ſet aſide the confeſſion of faith and catechiſms of the church, and even thoſe covenants which they uſed to conſider as the Shibboleth of their party, as often as they come in their way, and ſeem to interrupt their progreſs." Such an inference would be fairly drawn from the principles which they have here avowed, reſpecting the obligation of oaths; but the learned writer draws it from other premiſes.

Theſe premiſes are, *the Act of Forbearance* already quoted; the *alterations propoſed to be made in the Formula*; the *known opinions* of ſome members of the Aſſociate Synod, reſpecting *eſtabliſhments of* religion; and the principles of *democracy* which are ſuppoſed to prevail among Diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed church.

(To be continued.)

Sermons

Sermons preached at Laura Chapel, Bath, during the Season of Advent, 1799. By the Rev. Francis Randolph, D. D. Prebendary of Briſtol, and Chaplain to His Royal Highneſs the Duke of York. 8vo. Pp. 250. Rivingtons. London. 1800.

"THE Old Teſtament is not contrary to the New; for both in "the Old and New Teſtament, everlaſting life is offered to "mankind *by Chriſt*, who is the only mediator between God and man, "being both God and man. *Wherefore they are not to be heard which "feign, that the old fathers did look only for tranſitory promiſes.*"*

Such is the unerring chart by which the ſound and able divine, whoſe work we feel the higheſt ſatisfaction in recommending to the diſtinguiſhed patronage of the public, has ſteered his courſe, with all the ſucceſs which might be expected from the powers of a luminous mind employed in expounding and illuſtrating the truth of God, and the fundamental principles of the Chriſtian religion.

They, indeed, who would exalt the revelation of Jeſus, at the expence, and on the ruins of antecedent inſtitutions, may not be ſaid to miſtake the Antediluvian, the Patriarchal and the legal diſpenſation, but alſo to weaken the authority of that goſpel which they attempt to enforce. Becauſe all theſe ſeveral religious ſyſtems had the ſame divine original, and the ſame ſpecific object; all of them proceeded from the true Jehovah, who, in his heavenly wiſdom, thought fit to unfold, by regular gradation, the wonders of redeeming goodneſs; ſhadowing out by types and figures, by rites and ceremonies, what ſhould afterwards be accompliſhed in that Divine Perſon, who was ſent into the world to be the end of the law, and the fulneſs of the goſpel. To eſtabliſh theſe very important truths; to furniſh the orthodox believer with arguments, which all the power of the adverſary cannot gainſay nor reſiſt; to trace the ſyſtem of redemption through the generations of the world, from the fall of human nature in the firſt Adam, to its reſtoration in the ſecond; theſe are the objects, to the accompliſhment of which the author of the diſcourſes now under conſideration, has devoted his ſplendid profeſſional talents—to the ſtrength of ſolid argument, uniting all the faſcinating graces of diction; combining elegance with erudition, and taſte with piety; and in language always impreſſive and intereſting, ſometimes animated and ſublime, preaching Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever.

"* Article vii.

It

It can ſcarcely have eſcaped the obſervation of thoſe, who by their ſtudies and purſuits, or by their diſpoſition of mind, have been led to the inveſtigation of the ſubject, that from the moment when that virulent attack upon Chriſtianity (the traces of which are written in characters of blood throughout the civilized world) had its commencement, the defenders and advocates of our holy religion have been more diligent to diſſeminate and inculcate thoſe tenets which are more eſpecially the objects of faith. Aſſured, that while they had recourſe to this divine armoury for the weapons of their ſpiritual warfare, the efforts of their enemies would be vain and fruitleſs, they have wiſely availed themſelves of the advantageous poſition, which they were thus enabled to aſſume, and, entrenched within an impregnable bulwark, have triumphantly repelled the fury and malignity of their aſſailants. If ever, indeed, a time could have been found when the adoption of a contrary ſymptom might have been tolerated, certainly the preſent hour is not fitted for the frigid ethics of Ariſtotle, of Antoninus, or of Seneca, in "defence and confirmation of the goſpel," once delivered to the ſaints. The adverſaries of religion have aimed a deadly blow at her exiſtence; her friends have not been deficient in vigilance or intrepidity. And among the diſtinguiſhed champions for the truth we feel a degree of conſcious pride and pleaſure in recording the name of Dr. Randolph; whoſe admirable diſcourſes on the connection and harmony between the goſpel of Chriſt, and the faith of Noah, of Abraham, of Moſes, bring with them ſuch conviction, and aſſemble ſuch a maſs of evidence, from the viſible world, from the records of inſpiration, and from the compariſon of ancient predictions with their ſubſequent accompliſhment, that if by ſome diſaſtrous event, we had been deprived at once of all the compoſitions of the ancient fathers, divines, teachers, and apologiſts, this one work, had it been preſerved to mankind, would have been ſufficient, under the authority of the Scriptures, to have ſtemmed the torrent of infidelity, and to have eſtabliſhed on an unſhaken baſis the truths which they who believe in Chriſt hold moſt dear and ſacred.

The Diſcourſes are ſeven in number, delivered on the four Sundays in Advent, on Chriſtmas Day, on the ſucceeding Sunday, and on the firſt Sunday of the new Year: the whole forming a clear and connected ſyſtem of divinity, the parts of which mutually illuſtrate and elucidate each other, ſo as to embrace all which can be neceſſary to the diſcuſſion of the moſt important of all ſubjects, and to impreſs the ſtamp of goſpel truth, firmly and indelibly upon the mind. Of theſe, the firſt ſermon

(Hebrews

(Hebrews text, xiii. 8.) is the proem, or introduction; the laſt, (Pſalm lxxiv. 9.) the peroration, or cloſe. In the five intermediate diſcourſes, the main body of the evidence is collected; and its accumulated force is brought forward with an effect of which we ſhall be able to convey but a feeble idea in the analyſis, to which we ſhall proceed in the ſubſequent month. A deſign planned with more judgment, or executed with more felicity, the Chriſtian church has not witneſſed, from the days of Chryſoſtom to the preſent hour.

For the preſent we ſhall take our leave of this admirable performance, with the inſertion of the dedicatory epiſtle to the author's illuſtrious friend and patron. We think that few of our readers will differ from us in opinion, that in this ſtyle of compoſition, which requires the refined judgment of a maſter, our author has nearly reached the palm of perfection.

" It is not to ſhelter the following Diſcourſes under the protecting influence of an illuſtrious name, that I dedicate them to your Royal Highneſs; becauſe, whatever merit they may be thought to poſſeſs, it will only be acknowledged, in proportion as their intereſting truths ſhall appear to be ſanctioned by higher authority.

" At the ſame time, let me own myſelf far from being indifferent to your Royal Highneſs's approbation of them; ſince, in addition to the weight of ſuch teſtimony, in theſe times, in favour of Religion, when all earthly poſſeſſions are ſhrinking from the graſp, when every decoration and ſplendour of this life is fading away, they will have furniſhed reflections to render peaceful its awful cloſe, and, perhaps, perpetuate in your Royal Highneſs's memory an eſteem for him, who, with pride and gratitude, ſubſcribes himſelf

Your moſt faithful

And obliged humble ſervant,

F. RANDOLPH.

(To be continued.)

Remarks of the Caſſandra of Lycophron; a Monody. By the Rev. H. Meen, B. D. 8vo. Pp. 54. Rivingtons. London. 1800.

WE were not unacquainted with the critical abilities of this gentleman, though we were ſtrangers to his name till " THE REMARKS" were put into our hand. We long ago peruſed his occaſional annotations on Lycophron in the European Magazine, under the ſignature of E. And though we were momentarily pleaſed with ſomething like ſagacity; yet it was rather that quality which is poſſeſſed by an unriddler of enigmas, than the acuteneſs and diſcrimination of the claſſical

commentator. In the preſent publication, there is a great deal of the *difficiles nugæ*, though the general obſervations are not abſolutely devoid of merit.

"That the Caſſandra (ſays this writer) is but little read, and perhaps leſs underſtood, muſt be aſcribed to its obſcurity. Obſcurity is that bane of good writing, which every inſtructor in the art of rhetoric has condemned by precept, and which every writer, who aſpires at excellence, has in practice avoided. But, before the author of *Caſſandra* be included in that cenſure, and conſigned to that oblivion, which the generality of obſcure writers moſt juſtly merit, it may be proper to inveſtigate the cauſes of his obſcurity; and to ſhew, whether from a defect of genius, or from the choice of his ſubject, whether from neceſſity, or deſign, his obſcurity * originates."

The author attributes this obſcurity to the nature and character of the poem itſelf.

"The poem, that is confeſſedly oracular and prophetic, muſt conform to that ſtyle, in which prophecies and oracles have been delivered. It muſt be figurative. It muſt abound in metaphors and hyperboles. Mixed metaphors, words arbitrarily compounded, and of different dialects, may be adopted, as in this poem, with propriety. The names of animals may be ſubſtituted for the names of human creatures; and, as thoſe animals excel in ſtrength or intrepidity, in ſwiftneſs or ſagacity, their names may ſuggeſt the like qualities in men. The known appellations of heroes and of gods may be ſuppreſſed, and their atchievements and attributes may be admitted in their ſtead. By ſuch artifices may the ſhades of obſcurity be occaſionally, but not conſtantly heightened. The veil that ſeparates the paſt from the future muſt not be equally opaque. Its texture muſt vary as circumſtances require. Some proſpect, though diſtant and confuſed, muſt be preſented to the inquirer's view, ſufficient to arreſt his attention and encourage his reſearches."

The name of Lycophron (a native of Chalcis) has often occurred among thoſe competitors for fame who reſorted to Alexandria, to enjoy the patronage of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

And the "æra of the Ptolemies, (ſays Mr. M.) the moſt auſpicious to literature in general, was ſingularly favourable to the production of a prophetic poem. The celebrated library at Alexandria

* We can perceive, that this writer, though a good claſſical ſcholar, has not been much accuſtomed to Engliſh compoſition. He is deficient in eaſe. His periods are ſometimes moſt painfully laboured. With what a ſtrange inverſion are we preſented in the above ſentence; an inverſion, worthy the critic and the tranſlator of Lycophron!

was

was open for the inſpection of the curious. The Greek verſion of the Old Teſtament, undertaken by the Seventy at the command of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was here depoſited. The reſearches of the learned were gratified by a ready acceſs to the works, not only of profane poets, but of ſacred prophets. Here not pagan ſongs alone, the fancied dictates of ſome fabled muſe were ſubmitted to their peruſal; but hymns of an higher order; the ſacred ſongs of Sion, the unparalleled productions of genuine inſpiration."

"The prophetic form, into which his poem is caſt, was, moreover, happily adapted to the taſte and genius of the people among whom it was written. Egypt was early famous for judicial aſtrology and the occult ſciences. Seers of every name and deſcription were here foſtered and encouraged. The learning, which was diffuſed through the nation by their celebrated magi, was involved, both with regard to its ſubſtance and its form, in myſtic obſcurity. It is recorded of Lycophron, that he excelled in anagrammatic writing. Theſe productions were probably the playful amuſement of his lighter hours; purſued with leſs attention to the bent of his own genius than to the taſte of the times, whoſe predilection for the intricate and obſcure was evidenced by their fondneſs for this ſpecies of compoſition."

For the ſubject, "let it not be objected to this pſeudo-prophetic poem, that the tale of Troy's deſtruction, ſo often told, once more ſolicits the reader's attention. The epic, the lyric, and the tragic muſe have at different periods dignified and adorned it. On this ſubject the muſe of Pindar has occaſionally deſcanted. Æſchylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, have ſucceſſively taken up the tale, and devoted to the ſervice of the drama its moſt intereſting parts. It now meets us in another form; and comes recommended to our notice by thoſe ſingular decorations, and that novel dreſs, with which the frantic propheteſs has clothed it. Let it not abate our admiration of Caſſandra's rhapſody, that, however deſultory and vague it may ſeem, ſome reſemblance to theſe illuſtrious archetypes is ſtill retained; and that, even through the diſguiſe of artificial obſcurity, we recognize theſe excellent originals."

In order to prepare us for his own criticiſms, Mr. M. informs us, that his favourite poet hath been honoured with the attention of Canter, Meurſius, Potter, and other commentators of eminence, who have endeavoured to reduce the ravings of Caſſandra to ſome degree of conſiſtency. But, as the frantic propheteſs was too hard for them all, Mr. M. has ventured forth into the regions of poetic obſcurity; a bold adventurer indeed, confiding in his ſingle arm, and calling upon the learned world to ſurvey his proweſs, and reward his atchievements. Yet our daring knight may call as loudly as he pleaſes: the learned world will not attend his ſummons: his voice will become leſs and leſs diſtinct, as he follows Caſſandra to the field: and he will renew the combat almoſt with-

out a ſpectator. Enveloped in thick miſts, in vain will he "elicit from the dark lanthorn of Lycophron, ſome ſcintillations of light." To little purpoſe will he "work his way through the moſt perplexing wilds," or approach the ſeat of prophecy, the turret of Caſſandra, "the avenues to which had been hitherto inacceſſible." If he ſtorm the caſtle, who will witneſs his valour? If he ſnatch the trophies of victory, "they will diſappear in darkneſs."

Lycophron, it ſeems, has never yet been tranſlated into any modern language. Mr. M. therefore, exhibits himſelf as a poetical tranſlator, as well as a critical commentator. And, in order to diſplay the felicity, and ſet forth the merit of a firſt attempt, he thus ſpeaks of the verſifier of the claſſics in general:

"Tranſlation, once the arduous enterprize of a few, is placed within the reach of every verſifier. If therefore literary vanity look for gratification, it muſt ſeek it in ſome other department than that of tranſlation. Yet, though its day of fame be paſſed, its utility remains. Every firſt, however feeble be the attempt to clothe an ancient author in a modern dreſs, is entitled to ſome attention. For a vernacular verſion comes in aid of illuſtration. It gives to an obſcure original a more general notoriety and an eaſier acceſs."

Perhaps, poetic tranſlation was never ſo highly valued, or ſo juſtly appreciated, as at the preſent day. However facilitated by former verſions, the laſt Engliſh tranſlations of the Grecian bards could never have been produced but by claſſical learning and poetic genius. Faſtidious as the age may be, theſe laſt tranſlations have been received with great applauſe. Cowper's Homer is the only inſtance to the contrary.

We ſhall now proceed to bring our author's double character of critic and tranſlator to the teſt. This may be done, perhaps, to the ſatisfaction of our readers, by a few ſpecimens from the notes and from the verſe.

Ἣν τόργος ὑγρόφοιτος ἰκλοχέυται.

"Quam [Helenam] Aquila undivagus gignit.

"Interpreters remark, that τόργος, which uſually ſignifies a vulture or eagle, means *here* a ſwan. The epithet ὑγρόφοιτος ſeems to have ſuggeſted this interpretation. Let it, however, be obſerved, that in every other paſſage of Lycophron, where τόργος occurs, it ſignifies a very different animal.

"Oracular language delights in circumlocutions, figurative expreſſions, and ſymbols. Jupiter is here emblematically repreſented; and his emblem is an *eagle*. The bird of Jupiter is ſubſtituted for Jupiter himſelf. The compound epithet annexed, ὑγρόφοιτος, reminds the reader of the ſwan, whoſe ſhape the god aſſumed. It ſhould ſeem then, that τόργος ought not to be rendered *olor*, but *aquila*. The

former.

former interpretation is inartificial and unauthorized; the peculiarities of Caſſandra's oracular diction are preſerved by the latter."

In our opinion, τερεος has been properly tranſlated *olor*, a ſwan. That Jupiter begat Helen upon Leda, in the ſhape of a ſwan, is a fable known to every ſchoolboy. And the epithet ιγεοφοιτος, appropriate to the ſwan, would never have been applied to an eagle, by Caſſandra, in the maddeſt of her fits. But our commentator is much attached to double meanings; and would render even the riddling Lycophron ſtill more enigmatical. L. 144. We approve of πενταγαμβριαι for πενταγαμβραι; but we ſhould be glad to know from what ſource of information Mr. M. learned, that "Virgil read Lycophron's Caſſandra with ſingular delight; imitating often, as his cuſtom was, the moſt admirable paſſages in that poem." Virgil's Imitations (could he have produced them) would have enlivened the drearineſs of his ſubject—would have imparted even fruitfulneſs to ſterility. L. 324. Ιφιδος λεων. The obſervations, in this note, are more ingenious than ſolid. It would be difficult to prove, that Ptolemy's Poets read the Bible, either in the Greek Verſion, or the original Hebrew. The ſuppoſition is abſurd. Polwhele, in his notes on Theocritus, fell into a ſimilar error. Longinus ſeems to have been the firſt Heathen author, who was converſant with the ſacred Scriptures. L. 357. Here the conjectural emendation is ſpecious enough; but the old reading is unexceptionable. The advantage of Mr. M.'s reading above the common one is, that γαμφαισιν αρπης expreſs only the *beak* of the hawk; but that γαμφαισιν αρπαις, *bended hooks*, comprehend both *beak* and *talons*. L. 359. We object to Κορην as applied to Venus, and prefer the old reading and interpretation to the new. L. 1435. "If, inſtead of γαια and παλας, we read, διναις αλος, the antitheſis will be preſerved." A violent tranſmutation not warranted by the occaſion. Strong meaſures are ſometimes neceſſary in politics, and bold conjectures in criticiſm; but they are juſtified only by the greatneſs of the object. L. 1,443. This is a good note. We give the following as a ſpecimen of the tranſlation.

"SECT. 17.—*The ranſom, paid by Priam for the recovery of Hector's body, remanded by the Trojans when Achilles was ſlain—his aſhes depoſited in an urn, given to Thetis by Bacchus—his death lamented by the Muſes—his concealment to avoid the war—Caſſandra's grief renewed for Hector.*

But he, to whom was paid the ranſom-price,
Poiz'd in an even ſcale the ſum preciſe,
Soon with Pactolus' ore the ſcale ſhall freight,
And for his ranſom pay an equal weight.

To Bacchus' urn his aſhes ſhall deſcend,
Who dares the carcaſes of heroes vend;
Wept by the nymphs whom Bephyrus' ſtreams delight;
Who near Pimplea haunt Libethrus' height.
He his allotted doom diſmay'd ſhall hear,
The ſoldier ſhrinking with a coward's fear;
Content in female robes his form to hide,
And through the threads the rattling ſhuttle guide;
Laſt of his hoſt on hoſtile ground to leap,
And terrify thee, brother, e'en in ſleep.
Gods! our lorn houſe of this one ſtay bereft.
What pillar then to prop the ſtate is left."

After all, whatever Mr. Meen's pretenſions may be to the character of a critic or a poet, we think his labour loſt in the preſent inſtance. Lycophron is not only "ambiguouſly obſcure, but incorrigibly dull." For the character however of his poet, we refer the public to Mr. Meen himſelf. "To aſſiſt the reader's progreſs and alleviate his labours, this poem may be divided into parts, and thoſe parts into ſections, and to each ſection may be prefixed its contents. For want of theſe artificial helps, which are ſo needful here, the poem appears of an unuſual length and fatigues at once the eye and underſtanding. It preſents to both, a *chaos without form*, a labyrinth without a clue, a *wilderneſs*, *wild* and waſte, difficult of acceſs, and dangerous to enter. For though Caſſandra raves, her readers are ſober."—In truth, it is high time to put a period to her ravings!

Lectures on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. To which is added, an eſſay on Chriſtian Temperance and Self-denial: by the late George Campbell, D. D. Principal of Mariſchel College, Aberdeen. With ſome account of the Life and Writings of the Author. By the Rev. George Skene Keith, Keith Hall, Aberdeenſhire. 2 Vols. 8vo. Johnſon. London. 1800.

SO many men of eminence in the republic of letters have had their reputation leſſened by the injudicious publication of poſthumous works, that it was not without anxiety, and even ſome degree of alarm, that we opened the volumes before us. Dr. Campbell's fame reſts ſo ſecurely on his *Diſſertation on Miracles* in anſwer to Hume, on his *Philoſophy of Rhetoric*, and on *the diſſertations* preliminary to his tranſlation of the goſpels, that *we* ſhould have been afraid to publiſh any poſthumous work of ſuch an author, if he had not himſelf left expreſs directions for the publication, leſt the ſuperſtructure

ſtructure raiſed by himſelf had been ſhaken by our ill-poiſed buttreſs. A man of ſuch literary eminence as biſhop Hurd may indeed take liberties with the works of a friend with whom he was ſo intimate as his Lordſhip was with Biſhop Warburton; but we have no evidence whatever of Mr. Skene Keith's being on the ſame footing with Dr. Campbell, and we have very complete evidence that his abilities will not bear to be brought into compariſon with thoſe of the Biſhop of Worceſter.

As an introduction to theſe Lectures, he gives us a life of Dr. Campbell, written in a very unequal ſtyle, and with very little judgment. Becauſe his hero was a great and a good man, he is determined to make him one of thoſe "faultleſs monſters whom the world never ſaw." He is extremely ill-pleaſed with one author for having compared him to Dr. Leechman, late principal of the college of Glaſgow, though the compariſon, from his own account of it, ſeems to have been not only natural, but almoſt unavoidable. Becauſe another writer, ſpeaking of *the Philoſophy of Rhetoric*, ſays, that "his (Dr. Campbell's) philoſophy in general is the philoſophy of Dr. Reid; and where he differs from that acute reaſoner reſpecting abſtraction, and ſome other objects of metaphyſical diſquiſition, it is impoſſible to refuſe him the pre-eminence in every thing but ſtyle;" he labours, with ſome degree of ceremony, to prove what no man ſeems to have denied, that his ſtyle is *equal* to Dr. Reid's. Nay, he goes the length to ſay, that had Dr. Campbell's prelections in theology been finiſhed in his beſt manner, and given to the public, "they would have been, in his opinion, the greateſt preſent that not only Chriſtian divines, but alſo private Chriſtians, who are men of literature, have received ſince the days of Jerome," forgetting ſurely the preſent that was made to private Chriſtians, if not to ſuch learned divines as Mr. Skene Keith, when the ſcriptures were *firſt* tranſlated into Engliſh, and the other vernacular languages of Europe.

Such extravagant panegyric as this defeats its own aim, and is infinitely more prejudicial to the character of him who is the object of it, than the ſeverity with which, to the great offence of ſuch flimſy writers as our biographer, Johnſon has treated the later Britiſh poets. With all due veneration for the memory of Dr. Campbell, whom we conſider as one of the ableſt defenders of our holy religion, we cannot think him diſgraced by being brought into compariſon with Dr. Reid, a man who has often been compared to Bacon, to Malbranche, and to Locke! Of Dr. Leechman, indeed, we know very little; but we can hardly ſuppoſe the head of one college to be

ſo very inferior to the head of another, as to authorize Mr. Keith to call them *ſpirits of different orders!* And to prefer any courſe of theological lectures, proceeding from the pen of an uninſpired author, to the Engliſh verſion of the ſacred ſcriptures, appears to us to be ſomething bordering upon blaſphemy. That the man who can write in this ſtyle ſhould boaſt of Dr. Campbell's knowledge of the Greek language, and ſet him far above our *Burneys*, and *Glaſſes*, and *Porſons*, will not ſurprize our readers; though, "in the apprehenſion of this writer and others," to ſpeak in the ſtyle of Mr. Keith, a knowledge of the Greek language is the very laſt foundation on which the friends of the learned Principal ſhould attempt to build his fame.

His tranſlation of the Goſpel is not the ſubject of this review. We ſhould not, therefore, have noticed either its excellencies or its defects, had not we been called upon by this raſh man to compare a ſection of it with as much of the common verſion, and then to ſay, "which of the two, on the whole, has the beſt effect on our minds." We have made this compariſon between the two verſions of *the Sermon on the Mount*, as it ſtands in the goſpel by St. Matthew; and we ſay, with confidence, that the *old* verſion has the beſt effect on *our* minds, for this good reaſon, that it does not ſo often deviate from the ſenſe or the elegant ſimplicity of the original.

Dr. Campbell renders the firſt verſe of the ſixth chapter thus: "Take heed that ye perform not your *religious duties* before men, &c." But ελεημοσυνη never ſignifies *religious duties*, but *alms*, as our tranſlators have properly rendered it; as the Fathers of the Church always underſtood it; and as the etymology of the word and the ſenſe of the context abſolutely require it to be underſtood in this place. Our bleſſed Lord is here giving directions how to perform rightly the three capital duties of religion, *Almsgiving*, *Prayer*, and *Faſting*. He begins with *almsgiving*, then proceeds to *prayer*, and concludes with *faſting*; and Dr. Campbell might, with as much propriety, have rendered the words και ὁταν προσευχη (in the fifth verſe) ὁταν δε νηϛευηϛε (in the 16th) *when thou giveſt alms*, as he has rendered ελεημοσυνην (in the firſt verſe) *religious duties*.

Dr. Campbell tranſlates the fourth verſe of this chapter: "that thine alms may be in ſecret; and thy Father, *to whom nothing is ſecret, will himſelf recompenſe thee.*" No doubt, this is *nearly* the meaning of the original; but the words—*to whom nothing is ſecret, will himſelf recompenſe thee*, are no tranſlation of the Greek words; ὁ βλεπων εν τω κρυπτω, αυτος αποδωσει σοι, εν τω φανερω, which are very properly rendered by our tranſlators;

lators; and might be ſtill more literally rendered thus; "who ſeeth in ſecret, ſhall himſelf reward thee *in public.*"

In this boaſted tranſlation, the 7th verſe is thus rendered; "And in prayer *talk not idly* as *the Pagans*, who think that uſing many words will procure them acceptance." The people known in Judea by the Greek denomination οἱ ἐθνικοι, were never in that country called *Pagans* in Latin; nor was the term anywhere uſed as it is now uſed, for three hundred years after our Saviour's aſcenſion. Οἱ ἐθνικοι and *Pagans* are indeed, even yet, words of very different meaning: the former denoting ſuch antient nations as "were aliens from the commonwealth of *Iſrael*, and ſtrangers to the covenant of *promiſe*;" the latter, ſuch inhabitants of the Roman empire, as after the converſion of Conſtantine, continued to oppoſe the *religion of Chriſt.* We are fully aware of the difficulty of aſcertaining the preciſe and *original* import of the word βαττολογησητε, but μη βαττολογησητε is very improperly rendered into the vague expreſſion *talk not idly*, ſince its meaning in this place is aſcertained by the ſubſequent words to be what our tranſlators have rendered it—"uſe not vain repetitions."

In Dr. Campbell's verſion the firſt verſe of the ſeventh chapter is thus tranſlated: "Judge not, that ye be not judged; *for as ye judge*, ye ſhall be judged; and with the meaſure wherewith ye *give*, ye ſhall *receive*;" but μετρειτε does not ſignify *ye give*, nor ανταμεληθησεται υμιν—*ye ſhall receive*, nor εν ω γαρ κριματι—*for as ye judge!* The authorized verſion is here ſo perfect that it ſeems impoſſible to improve it either in ſound or in ſenſe; and the learned Principal's verſion is certainly inferior to it in both. His tranſlation of the next verſe, however, is ſtill more extraordinary; "and why obſerveſt thou the mote in thy brother's eye, but art inſenſible of the *thorn* in thine own eye?" That δοκος *never* ſignifies a thorn we will not be confident, though we have never *met* with it in that ſenſe; but that it does not ſignify a thorn here is moſt obvious, becauſe a *thorn* in the eye would produce ſuch exquiſite pain, that no man could be ſuppoſed, even in *a metaphor*, to be inſenſible of it in his own eye. The truth is, that the eye is ſometimes ſubject to a diſeaſe, in which a dark line reaches from the upper to the lower part in ſuch a manner as to divide the pupil into two, making every object appear double. It is to this diſeaſe that our Saviour alludes, when, in the 22d verſe of the preceding chapter, he ſays, if thine eye be ἁπλους ſingle, (not *ſound* as Dr. Campbell tranſlates the word) "thy whole body ſhall be full of light." The black line producing this double viſion was, by the Jews, called a *beam*, probably becauſe the perſon affected with it, really ſees objects indiſtinctly

tinctly as if a beam were interpoſed between his eye and them; and hence, a cenſorious perſon, who extenuated his own faults and magnified thoſe of his neighbour, was, among that people, proverbially ſaid to have a *beam* in his eye.

The doctor tranſlates the words το δε σαπρον δενδρον, in the 17th. verſe, "every *evil* tree;" but the word *evil* is ſo vague, that when applied to a tree it has no preciſe meaning. The word σαπρον literally ſignifies *rotten*, or, as our tranſlators have rendered it, *corrupt*, and the whole verſe might be properly tranſlated; "every *freſh* tree yieldeth good fruit, but every *rotten* or corrupt tree, evil fruit."

Theſe few ſtrictures, and we might have made triple the number even on the ſingle ſection entitled *the Sermon on the Mount*, are perhaps ſufficient to ſhow the extreme raſhneſs of Mr. Skene Keith, where he claims for Dr. Campbell a very high place among the Greek ſcholars of the age, and much more when he holds him up as a greater maſter of that language than the divines, who were employed by King James I. to tranſlate the Greek Scriptures. The truth is, that Dr. Campbell appears to have been a man of very various attainments in *metaphyſics*, *morals*, *theology*, *Belles Lettres*, and *botany*; and when all this is conſidered, together with the laborious duties, which, for nine years, he performed as the paſtor of a country pariſh, we are ſo far from being ſurprized at his not being the firſt Greek ſcholar of the age, that we are rather ſurprized at his having attained ſo conſiderable a ſhare of Greek learning as he undoubtedly poſſeſſed. Our indignation is excited, not againſt him, for he did more than moſt men for the cauſe of truth, but againſt his biographer for not reſtraining his own labours to a ſimple narrative of his hero's life, and getting his literary character deſcribed by Dr. Beattie or ſome other man capable of eſtimating it. Highly as we think of Dr. Campbell, it is too much to ſay of him that "few of the children of men have poſſeſſed his reach of mind and diverſified *erudition!*"

Our readers will form their own opinion of his reach of mind and his erudition, and that opinion will be high, when they conſider what he performed during the courſe of not a very long life, of which the following narrative contains the principal events.

Dr. George Campbell was the youngeſt ſon of the Rev. Colin Campbell, one of the miniſters of Aberdeen. He was born in that city on the 25th of December, 1719, and was by death deprived of his father before he had completed his ninth year. His education, however, was not neglected. Having ſtudied the Latin tongue in the Grammar School of Aberdeen, he

he was admitted, we know not in what year, into Mariſchal College, where he went through the uſual courſe of Greek philoſophy and mathematics. Being intended for the profeſſion of the law, he ſerved an apprenticeſhip to *a writer to the Signet* in Edinburgh; and to this circumſtance, his biographer, differing widely in opinion from Swift concerning the general effects of legal ſtudy, attributes his ingenuity in reaſoning.

Becoming diſſatisfied with the employment of a lawyer, which, he ſaid, had made him loſe a great part of the Greek that he had learned at college, he entered himſelf a ſtudent of theology, firſt in the Univerſity of Edinburgh and afterwards in that of Aberdeen, and redoubled his aſſiduity to recover the language which he had loſt. Not ſatisfied with barely attending the prelections of the theological profeſſors in the Univerſity of Aberdeen, he inſtituted a theological club or ſociety for the improvement of ſuch ſtudents, as, like himſelf, were deſirous of combining the pleaſures of converſation with the purſuit of ſacred literature. This club ſeems to have been admirably calculated for the improvement of the young men who had the happineſs to be members of it, and by its regulations did great credit to the judgment of its founder.

On the 11th of June, 1746, Mr. Campbell was licenſed by the preſbytery of Aberdeen as a *prelectioner* or preacher of the goſpel; and, being in 1747, diſappointed of a church living through the baleful influence of *clanſhip*, he was, next year, preſented to the church of *Benchary Ternan*, ſeventeen miles weſt from the city of Aberdeen. This preſentation did equal honour to the patron and the preſentee. Sir Alexander Burnett of Leys—the patron—knew nothing of Mr. Campbell, but his fame as a preacher, and his general good character; and conſidering patronage as a ſacred truſt, he conferred the living upon a young man of ſuch acknowleged merit, without having been ſolicited to do ſo by a ſingle individual, who knew even the *Chriſtian* name of the preacher.

It was in the pariſh of Benchary Ternan, that he firſt conceived the idea of tranſlating the four Goſpels; and in the ſame ſequeſtered place, he compoſed a part of his Philoſophy of Rhetoric.

On the 23d of June, 1757, he was tranſlated to one of the churches of Aberdeen, when he became a member of *the literary ſociety*, which was compoſed of the profeſſors of the two colleges of which the univerſity of that city conſiſts. In the year 1759, he was preſented by His Majeſty to the office of Principal of Mariſchal College, procured for him by Archibald Duke of Argyle, not in conſequence of his literary

terary eminence, but becauſe he had deſcended from the family of Argyle. He ſoon made it appear, however, that he was worthy of his new dignity. On the 9th of October, 1760, he preached, before the provincial Synod of Aberdeen, a ſermon on the ſubject of miracles in anſwer to Hume's artful eſſay; and being requeſted by his learned audience to publiſh that diſcourſe, he threw it into the form of a diſſertation, and gave it to the public in 1763. That diſſertation, of which the merit has been univerſally acknowleged—acknowleged even by Hume himſelf—has had the honour not only of going through ſeveral editions at home, but alſo of being tranſlated into the French, Dutch, and German languages. Previous to this publication, he had been created D. D. by the univerſity of King's College.

As principal of Mariſchal College, and one of the miniſters of the city, Dr. Campbell conducted himſelf in ſo exemplary a manner as to gain the love and veneration of all with whom he was connected. On the 26th of June, 1771, he was elected, by the town-council, profeſſor of divinity in the college over which he had preſided, with ſuch credit to himſelf, for twelve years; and, in conſequence of this appointment, he reſigned his paſtoral charge as one of the miniſters of Aberdeen, though he was ſtill obliged to preach every Lord's day in one of the eſtabliſhed churches. He increaſed the duties of the profeſſorſhip, improved the plan of theological ſtudy, and delivered thoſe admirable lectures, of which his biographer gives ſo extravagant a character. This compelled him to return to his ſtudies, which we are here told he had for ſome years neglected, and the fruits of thoſe ſtudies were the preliminary diſſertations publiſhed with his tranſlation of the goſpels, and the volumes of lectures which are now before us.

In 1766, he publiſhed, beſides his Philoſophy of Rhetoric, in two volumes, a ſermon preached on the national faſt, of ſuch intrinſic merit, that 6,000 copies of it were afterwards printed and circulated, at the deſire of Dean Tucker, through America. He publiſhed, indeed, at different times, many occaſional ſermons, which our limits permit us not to enumerate far leſs to characterize; but his greateſt, though in our opinion not his happieſt, work, was the tranſlation of the Goſpels, which, with the preliminary diſſertations, iſſued from the preſs of Strahan and Cadell, in two vols. 4to. 1789.

After this period he continued to diſcharge in that exemplary manner in which he had ever diſcharged them, the duties of various offices, till feeling the powers of his nature much weakened, he offered (we know not in what year) to reſign

reſign the profeſſorſhip of divinity, provided any one of three gentlemen, whom he named, ſhould be appointed his ſucceſſor. The terms were not agreed to by the town-council of Aberdeen, and he continued to hold the office till June 1795, when he reſigned it in favour of Dr. William Laurence Brown, who had been driven from the univerſity of Utrecht for his loyalty to the Prince of Orange, and his attachment to his native country. Sometime afterwards His Majeſty conferred upon Dr. Campbell a penſion of 300l. a year on condition of his reſigning the office of Principal of Mariſchal College, in which alſo he was ſucceeded by Dr. Brown.

The well-merited bounty of his Sovereign, this great and good man did not long enjoy. On the ſecond of April, 1796, a ſtroke of palſy deprived him of the power of ſpeech, and apparently of all ſenſibility; but he lingered not long under this heavy diſtreſs, for, though Mr. Keith does not ſpecify the day of his death, he informs us that his funeral ſermon was preached by Dr. Brown on the 17th of the ſame month in which he was firſt rendered ſpeechleſs by the palſy.

Dr. Campbell was married, but ſeems from the narrative before us to have left no child behind him. From his character, as drawn by his biographer, he appears to have been as amiable in domeſtic, as he certainly was reſpectable in public life; and we read, with peculiar ſatisfaction, that this acute metaphyſician "highly diſapproved of the modern Socinians or rationaliſts, as they call themſelves, who attempt to explain away the peculiar doctrines of the Goſpel."

To his biographical ſketch of Dr. Campbell, Mr. Keith ſubjoins *a general view of his prelections in theology*; from which we learn that he divided the ſubject "into two principal heads, viz. *theory* and *practice*. By the theory he meant *all that was (is) neceſſary to be underſtood* by a young man *in point of knowledge*; by the practice, *all that was* (is) *neceſſary* either for a miniſter of a pariſh, or a ſtudent of divinity, to *enable him to make a proper application of that knowledge*, ſo as to render it moſt beneficial to others and moſt ſatisfactory to his own mind." We know not what is meant by practice, enabling a *ſtudent* of divinity to make a proper *application* of that knowledge which, as a *ſtudent*, he muſt be ſuppoſed not yet to have acquired, and which he is called upon by no duty to communicate to others.

"Under the firſt head, or theory, Dr. Campbell included ſacred or church hiſtory, ſacred criticiſm, and polemic divinity. Under the ſecond head, or practice, he included pulpit eloquence, propriety of character in *private* life, or teaching by example, and propriety of character in *public* life, or a proper diſcharge of public duties, viz. catechizing, preaching, public worſhip, and adminiſtering the ſacraments;

ments; as alſo a faithful diſcharge of a miniſter's duty, as a member of the Church courts of the Scotch eſtabliſhment."

Theſe are the outlines of a valuable courſe of theological lectures; and yet they have diſappointed us. From a Profeſſor of Divinity, eminent for his metaphyſical acumen, we ſhould certainly have looked for, at leaſt, one lecture on *natural religion*, if it had been only to guard the ſtudents againſt being miſled by the *ignes fatui* of ſyſtem bearing that title. Whether there be any ſyſtem of religious truths and religious duties that can be called *natural?* If there be, to *what* truths and duties that ſyſtem extends? and in what *ſenſe* ſuch truths and duties are to be conſidered as *natural?* are queſtions of the higheſt importance, which few men have been better qualified to anſwer than Dr. Campbell. We are, therefore, aſtoniſhed that he ſhould have paſſed them without notice, in a courſe of lectures meant to comprehend *all that is neceſſary to be underſtood* here, whoſe future deſtination is to "feed the flock of Chriſt," and defend it from "wolves who come in ſheep's cloathing."

(To be continued.)

The poems of Allan Ramſay.—A New Edition corrected and enlarged, with a Gloſſary.—To which are prefixed a Life of the Author, from authentic Documents; and Remarks on his Poems, from a large View of their Merits.—In two Volumes. 8vo. Cadell and Davis. 1800.

OF all the occupations, in which talents and judgment can poſſibly be exerted, there is perhaps no one more laudable, and certainly few more pleaſing, than that of appreciating the merits of a celebrated writer. Not many, comparatively, are the men, whatever their genius may actually have been, who have received any thing like juſtice, at the hands of their cotemporaries. It is only when they have paſſed from the ſtage of life, when the voice of envy, and the jarrings of competition are heard no more, that an after age is enabled to rejudge their exertions, and pronounce with candour. So ſtrikingly true is, indeed, the remark, and ſo capricious the allotment of literary reputation, that frequently the authors who have obtained the higheſt niches in the temple of fame, are not thoſe who, while living, were moſt fondly idolized, but thoſe, on the contrary, who were as ſtrangely undervalued by their equals, until they were placed beyond the reach of cenſure or of praiſe.

The

The preſent editors of the poems of Allan Ramſay (for more than *one* perſon we muſt believe to be concerned in the work) are doubtleſs entitled to no inconſiderable portion of our applauſe, for the elegant and attractive manner in which they have brought forward, in this new edition, the very various, and as unequal compoſitions of the Scottiſh Theocritus. To an author, who, during his life-time, was ſo ſedulous in collecting and publiſhing his own pieces, little, if any thing that is new, now remains to be added, after the lapſe of more than ſeventy years: of courſe, there is little, in regard to original matter, that can be expected to call forth the examination of the critic. But, as the preſent editors have enriched their work with a new biography of their author, and a copious eſſay on his writings and genius; we are perſuaded we ſhall both gratify our readers, and promote the main object of our deſign, by giving ſome account, not only of the poet himſelf, but of the merit of theſe his editors; pointing out, at the ſame time, as our duty is, the tendency and effects, which the well known celebrity of the one, aided and embelliſhed by the labours of the others, ſeems calculated to produce.

Allan Ramſay was born, as his preſent biographer informs us, on the 16th of October, 1686, in the pariſh of Crawford-moor, in Lanerkſhire.—

"A zealous genealogiſt," he ſays, "could eaſily trace, Ramſay to the family of the Earl of Dalhouſie. His father was Robert Ramſay, who inherited, as it were, the management of Lord Hopeton's lead-mines, in Crawford-moor: his grand-father was Robert Ramſay, a writer in Edinburgh, who had the management of the ſame mines: his great-grand-father was captain John Ramſay, the ſon of Ramſay of Cockpen, who was brother of Ramſay of Dalhouſie. Of this genealogy our poet ſpeaks proudly, when he recollects,

> Dalhouſie of an auld deſcent,
> My chief, my ſtoop, my ornament.—Pp. 5. 6.

While yet an infant, Ramſay had the misfortune to loſe his father; and the marriage of his mother, which ſoon after happened, leaving him "without property, or the means of procuring any," he was, in 1701, in the fifteenth year of his age, ſent to Edinburgh, and bound apprentice to a wig-maker; an occupation, as we may ſuppoſe, little ſuited to his temper or genius. This profeſſion, his laborious biographer is careful to tell us, is not at all the ſame as that of a *barber*; adducing various evidence (by which we are not convinced) in order to prove, that, in the metropolis of Scotland, "the two trades were not *co-incident* in that age." If they were not then

co-incident

coincident, to uſe a phraſeology ſo perfectly appropriate to a *wig-maker*, they were, at leaſt, not widely *divergent*; and ſo accordingly they continue to this day. Although a reader of poetry in his twentieth year, and the frequenter of a literary club, of which we find the learned and accompliſhed Dr. Pitcairn was alſo a member, our bard produced nothing that could remind us of the infantine performances of Cowley, of Milton, or of Pope. His firſt attempt, which has been carefully preſerved, is an addreſs "to the moſt happy members of the Eaſy Club." It is, to confeſs the truth, a contemptible effort, and not calculated to give the moſt diſtant promiſe of future excellence.

In 1716, we find his habit of writing greatly improved, as well as his fame and conſideration in the city of Edinburgh.

"He wrote many petty poems, which from time to time he publiſhed, at a proportionate price. In this form, his poetry was at that time attractive; and the women of Edinburgh were wont to ſend their children, with a penny, to buy 'Ramſay's laſt piece." Pp. 14, 15.

It was about this time likewiſe that he publiſhed an edition of "Chriſt's Kirk on the Green," a ludicrous poem of King James the Firſt's of Scotland, to which he ſucceſsfully added two cantos: and, in 1721, he at length ventured to ſend forth his miſcellaneous poems "in the dignified form of a quarto;" concluding the work, after the manner of Horace, *ad librum ſuum*,

Gae, ſpread my fame:
Away, and fix me an immortal name.
Ages to come ſhall thee revive,
And gar thee wi' new honours live.—

This "dignified" volume, as it appears, was uſhered into the world by a numerous liſt of ſubſcribers, "conſiſting of all who were either eminent or fair in Scotland," and actually procured for the poet, beſides a diſtinguiſhed patronage, the more ſolid recompenſe of four hundred guineas; without doubt a conſiderable ſum at the commencement of the preſent century.

From this period, Ramſay was regarded as among the foremoſt poets of his time, whether in the ſouth or north. In 1724, he publiſhed "The Tea-table Miſcellany," being a collection of ſongs, both Scotch and Engliſh, which he freely dedicated

To ilka lovely Britiſh laſs,
Frae Lady Charlotte, Ann, and Jean,
Down to ilk bonny ſinging Beſs,
Wha dances bare-foot on the green.

So

So singularly pleasing and popular was the work, (to which two other volumes were afterwards added) that it soon went through no fewer than twelve different editions; a surprising number at a time, when booksellers, as yet, had not learnt the happy art of procuring, for a favourite author, the fame, if not the profit, of as many editions as they please, with the expense and trouble of only a single impression*. During the same year, we find, that he likewise published "The Evergreen," a collection of Scotch poems, "wrote by the ingenious before 1600." Here Ramsay is very justly charged, by his biographer, with having not only so "changed the orthography, and modernized the verse, that the state of the language, and the nature of the poetry, during former times, could no longer be discovered," but, also, with inserting in his collection several compositions, which he must have known to be of far more modern date. Among the latter description, was the curious, and well-known piece, entitled "Hardyknute a fragment," (republished afterwards by Dodsley in 1740) which our indefatigable biographer pretty clearly traces to a female pen, viz. that of Lady Wardlaw of Pitrevie in Fifeshire, and whom he afterwards (at page 38.) inaccurately calls "Lady Elizabeth Wardlaw."—

Of the precise era, when Ramsay exchanged his profession of wig-maker for that of bookseller, we are not informed: but, from a note at page 35, it appears to have been some time between 1716 and 1725; in the latter of which years he is no longer styled "Piriwige-maker," but distinguished by the more honourable appellation of "Bookseller," in the parish-registers. This event, together with the consequences, both internal and external, which it must have produced on the poet, was, beyond question, the most remarkable occurrence in his life, and might, in our judgment, advantageously have occupied that portion of the biography before us, where some awkward attempts are made at the exercise of criticism, and the display of taste. But as the author seems to possess but a small portion of the *divinæ particula auræ*, this

* In our own memory, if we rightly recollect (but previous to the commencement of our labours) the very notable performance of Mr. Barrister Erskine, entitled "a View of the Causes and Consequences of the War with France" went through no fewer than *five and forty* editions within the year.

is a ſtyle of writing, for which his talents are but little fitted. We, however, learn, that—

"In 1726, Ramſay removed from his original dwelling, at the Mercury, oppoſite the Croſs-well, to a houſe which had been the London Coffee-houſe, in the eaſt end of the Luckenbooths. With this change of ſituation, he altered his ſign; and, inſtead of the original Mercury, he now adopted the heads of two poets, Drummond of Hawthornden, and Ben Jonſon. Here he ſold, and lent books, till a late period of his life: here the wits of Edinburgh uſed to meet for amuſement, and for information. From this commodious ſituation, Gay, a congenial poet, was wont to look out upon the Exchange of Edinburgh, in order to know perſons, and aſcertain characters. Pp. 39. 40."

This "congenial poet," we think, must have looked out upon the exchange with an eye of *prophecy*, (a poetical gift alſo) as well as diſcernment; for the building ſo called, in Edinburgh, was not begun to be erected till leſs than* half a century ago.

Somewhat previous to this period, Ramſay ſeems to have turned his thoughts to paſtoral poetry, the ſpecies of compoſition of all others the moſt peculiarly adapted to his genius. He wrote a paſtoral, entitled "Richy and Sandy," on the death of Addiſon, and another on that of Prior. He compoſed, in 1721, "Patie and Roger," and addreſſed the piece to Joſiah Burchet, one of his earlieſt patrons, who was long Secretary to the Admiralty, and a poet alſo of that day†. In 1723, he publiſhed "Jenny and Meggy," being equal to the paſtoral juſt now mentioned: and by the advice of his literary friends, about two years after, he happily executed the project of conjoining the two pieces, and giving a dramatic form and character to the whole. Thus was produced "The Gentle Shepherd," a paſtoral drama which we do not heſitate to pronounce to be the fineſt effort of that deſcription, by any author, or in any language with which we are acquainted. Why the time of its appearance ſhould be eſteemed "a moment ſo propitious for (what the biographer

---

* See Arnot's Hiſtory of Edinburgh.

† "Burchet left behind him 'A Hiſtory of the Navy,' which is now nearly forgotten. This gentleman ſeems to have been greatly captivated by Ramſay's muſe:

Go on, famed bard, the wonder of our days,
And crown thy head with never-fading bays;
While grateful Britons do thy lines revere,
And value, as they ought, their Virgil here.—P. 18."

calls)

calls) *ſhepherdiſh* poetry," we cannot tell; as it will ſcarcely be ſaid that Pope, the contemporay of Ramſay touched the true notes of this ſpecies of ſong: but we moſt heartily concur with the author, in reprobating the uncommon petulance, and ſtill more the uncommon dullneſs, of the editor of antient Scottiſh poems, (publiſhed An. 1786) who has taken it upon him to declare, that the Gentle Shepherd is "more barbarous and ſtupid than the Beggar's Opera," by which he appears to poſſeſs but a very incompetent notion of the real character of either‡. In June 1725, Ramſay dedicated his performance, in plain proſe, to Suſannah, Counteſs of Eglinton.

"There was at the ſame time," as we are told, "a poetical dedication, of more elaborate praiſe, by Hamilton of Bangour, an amiable man, an accompliſhed poet, who finiſhed his ſhort career, at Lyons, in 1754, at the age of fifty. This is the ſame dignified lady, to whom, at the age of 85, Johnſon and Boſwell offered their homage; whoſe powers of pleaſing continued ſo reſplendent, as to charm the faſtidious ſage into a declaration, that, in viſiting ſuch a woman, he had ſpent his day well," Pr. 34, 35.—

On this delightful drama, this *monumentum ære perennius*, we forbear to enlarge, until we come to ſpeak of the critical eſſay on the writings of its author.

In ſpite of the malice of enemies, and the envy of rivals, Ramſay ſtill continued to write, and to publiſh, and to pleaſe the public. He printed his "Fables and Tales" in 1722; his tale of "The Three Bonnets" in the ſame year; "The Fair Aſſembly" in 1723; together with his poem "On Health," which he addreſſed to the great Earl of Stair, the ſame who was Ambaſſador at the court of Lewis XIV. and in this manner he was enabled, in 1728, to ſend forth a ſecond "dignified" quarto, including "The Gentle Shepherd," and his "Maſque on the Nuptials of the Duke of Hamilton." Of this quarto an 8vo. edition came out, in 1729; and both quarto volumes were re-printed in London, for the bookſellers, during the year 1731. His laſt work was "A Collection of Thirty Tables," which made its appearance in 1730. At the age of forty-five, we find that Ramſay ceaſed to write for the public eye, after his fame had ſpread and his compoſitions were diffuſed, not only over England and Ireland, but

‡ See Antient Scottiſh Poems (1786) p. 113; which ſhould be carefully diſtinguiſhed from a very different work, publiſhed by the late accompliſhed, and learned Sir David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes, in 1768, where there are much ingenious remark, and elegant criticiſm,

alſo over the colonies, in various and repeated impreſſions.—He died at Edinburgh, on the 7th of January 1758, when paſt ſeventy-two, and, as it is believed, in affluent circumſtances. Ramſay left two ſons, and ſeveral daughters. The eldeſt ſon, of his own name, was portrait-painter to his Majeſty; and the ſon of the latter, John Ramſay, is now, we underſtand a Lieutenant Colonel in the 3d regiment of foot-guards.

Thus we have curſorily ſketched, from the work before us, and for the entertainment of our readers, the life of a poet who has juſtly been ſtyled the Scottiſh Theocritus, and, with the exception only of Thomſon and perhaps of Burns, is, without doubt, the moſt eminent of any that have yet appeared North of the Tweed.

(To be continued.)

Benſon's Vindication of the Methodiſts.

(Continued from p. 170, *Vol.* vii.)

IN regard to the *Claſs Meetings*, we have reaſon to believe that the reporters are not ſo *entirely unacquainted* with the nature and purport of them as Mr. B. inſinuates, or as he, perhaps, would wiſh them to be. From our own knowledge we can venture to affirm, that nothing has been advanced reſpecting the meetings, which we conſider as the grand nurſery of Methodiſm, of the truth of which abundant proofs are not ready to be produced. We will, therefore, in our turn, give the author of the Vindication ſome little information as to the manner in which theſe claſs meetings are conducted in the country. The reporters have not, that we know of, poſitively affirmed that the pretenders to exorciſm have practiſed their capricious forms and modes of it in the claſs meetings only; ſuch an aſſertion would not have been ſtrictly conſonant to the truth; for almoſt all the members of the ſociety reſident in the diſtrict alluded to, know full well, that thoſe raving enthuaſiſts, known by the name of the Yorkſhire Colliers, were cordially admitted into their reſpective meeting-houſes, that there they practiſed their exorciſms, and many other groſs deluſions; and that they were, moreover, eſpouſed, careſſed, and treated with the utmoſt hoſpitality, not only by their preachers, both ſtationary and ſupernumerary, but alſo by many others the abettors of methodiſm. All that they meant to ſay, as far as we are able to comprehend their meaning, was that various groſs miſrepreſentations and impoſtures had been *chiefly propagated and ſupported* by means of thoſe claſs meetings; and this, we believe,

believe, to have been literally the caſe; for at thoſe more private aſſemblies, every thing tranſacted at the meeting-houſe, whatever has been done or ſaid by the preacher, is there copiouſly detailed by the leaders of the claſſes, in ſuch terms as cannot fail of making the wiſhed for impreſſion upon the minds of their hearers.

That "the perſon who preſides in the claſs meetings, and who is termed the leader, is frequently a preacher," we confidently deny. For in the diſtrict to which the report relates, which contains almoſt two hundred pariſhes, there are not more than five or ſix preachers in the connection, and one ſupernumerary ſtationed; it is utterly impoſſible, therefore, that, out of this ſmall number, a preacher ſhould be found to preſide in the various claſs meetings which are held weekly in this diſtrict, and that generally on the Lord's day. In cities, however, and large populous and commercial towns, we are ready to allow that the caſe may be as Mr. B. has repreſented.

According to the rules of the ſociety, *a leader ought to be a perſon of clear experience and ſound judgment, truly devoted to God, zealous for the ſalvation of ſouls, of upright converſation, and one who has* GIFTS *proper for the work.* It is his buſineſs, moreover, to ſee each perſon in his claſs *once* a week at leaſt, and to inquire *how their ſouls proſper; how they keep the rules of the ſociety; how they grow in the knowledge and love of God; and he is to adviſe, reprove, comfort or exhort, as occaſion may require.*

From this account it will appear, that the leader of a claſs has indeed an arduous office upon his hands, and that very few perſons in the country will be found who are duly qualified for ſuch an undertaking; for no *ſmall ſhare of judgment and diſcretion* is requiſite on the part of him who is to make the foregoing inquiries, leſt, peradventure, overrating his GIFTS, he ſhould overſtep the line of his duty, and be tempted to a groſs abuſe and perverſion of his office. Many inſtances of this nature, we ſcruple not to affirm, have been known to exiſt, and do at this preſent time exiſt, in the Lincolnſhire diſtrict. Several of the leaders of claſſes are there known to us, whom we could enumerate by name, who can hardly be ſaid to have been trained up in the firſt rudiments of knowledge, and who, of courſe, are wholly unqualified for the office of teachers or exhorters. Of theſe ſome are butchers and ſhoemakers, and others ſhepherds, day labourers, and menial ſervants. Will then Mr. B., whom we conſider as the Goliath and doughty champion of his ſect, have the temerity to decide abſolutely upon the character of theſe men? Will he venture poſitively to aſſert, that perſons of low and obſcure ſtations, who have been nominated to the

office of leaders, are, without exception, *men of clear experience and ſound judgment, and endowed with Gifts* proper for the work? We, alas! can aſſure him, that the caſe is far otherwiſe; we know that many of theſe ignorant and fanatic leaders are the inveterate enemies of the eſtabliſhment, and are altogether indefatigable in their endeavours to draw aſide the honeſt cottager and the induſtrious labourer from his duty, and to prevent the attendance on the public worſhip of the church, telling them that churches are but uſeleſs buildings, being nothing but a heap of ſtones; that the pure doctrine of the Goſpel is ſeldom, if ever, preached therein; and that out of their own ſociety ſalvation is not to be had. Theſe men, likewiſe, preſuming upon their office, imagine themſelves to be transformed into preachers, and accordingly perform more than is required of them by the rules of the ſociety; for, in addition to ſinging, praying, and relating their own EXPERIENCES, and hearing thoſe of others; they arrogate to themſelves the right of expounding the ſcriptures; and thus, by handling the word of God, ignorantly and deceitfully, they ſeduce the unwary, and propagate errors of a dangerous and deſtructive tendency.

Theſe claſs meetings, therefore, we cannot but view with a ſuſpicious and fearful eye; they are the very hot-beds of ſuperſtition and enthuſiaſm, from whence an almoſt inconceivable number of ignorant and deluded perſons are yearly tranſplanted out of the eſtabliſhed Church into the conventicle or meeting-houſe: and the country leaders, of whom we are now ſpeaking, may be conſidered in many reſpects, to reſemble thoſe who, in the words of the Apoſtle, were wont to *creep into houſes*—to inſinuate themſelves into private families, *and lead ſilly women captive*—thoſe of weak and unſtable minds, who were ready to run after and to hear every new teacher; and who, *toſſed about by every wind of doctrine, are never able to come to the knowledge of the truth*, or to attain any fixed or ſteady principles with regard to religion. In like manner do theſe men, by the recital of trifling and unmeaning anecdotes, by an exaggerated relation of the *experiences* of themſelves and others, and ſuppoſed miraculous interpoſitions, and by falſe pretenſions to miracles, of various and extraordinary kinds, at length win over to their own extravagant tenets a manifold variety of deluded converts, *who, after their own luſts, have heaped to themſelves teachers, having itching ears.*

To theſe ignorant leaders of claſſes may be juſtly applied the epithet of "*blind guides*;" *they are, indeed, blind leaders of the blind*; and we fully agree with Mr. B. *that if the blind thus lead the blind, they both muſt*, inevitably *fall into the ditch*: and to theſe unauthoriſed and uncommiſſioned teachers, we would ſtrongly recommend

recommend, in future, an attentive conſideration of the following texts:—"Let every man abide in the ſame calling wherein he is called:" the meaning of which is, let every one remain in that ſtate, profeſſion, or circumſtance of life, in which he was educated and brought up, and in which various opportunities occur for him to evince the ſincerity of his faith, by ſhewing that "in whatever ſtate he is, he hath learned therewith to be content;" and "living ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly, in this preſent world," let him alſo *ſtudy therein to be quiet, and to do his own buſineſs, working with his hands the thing which is good.* Phil. iv. 11. Tit. ii. 12. 1 Theſſ. iv. 11. Epheſ. iv. 28.

There is another circumſtance, of which we think it our duty at this juncture to remind Mr. B. as it is poſſible he may, THROUGH INADVERTENCE, have overlooked it in his preſent Vindication; that is, in his recapitulation of the duties attached to claſs leaders, he hath evidently forborn to mention what we muſt ever deem a moſt eſſential one, inaſmuch as the proſperous or declining ſtate of the funds of the whole ſociety principally depends upon the due performance of it. In the *General Rules*, publiſhed in 1798, the leaders of claſſes are directed "*to receive what each perſon is willing to give for the ſupport of the Goſpel; to pay the ſtewards what they have received of their ſeveral claſſes; and to ſhew their account of what each perſon hath contributed.*" On the individual exertions of theſe leaders much, therefore, depends; and great care, no doubt, is taken, in the ſelection of this deſcription of officers, that they are *duly qualified, and have* GIFTS *proper for the work.* What is to be underſtood by the word GIFTS, we are really at a loſs to comprehend; but we conceive that the GIFT of *enticing words wherewith they may beguile their hearers*, and by which the *cunning craftineſs of men who lie in wait to deceive*, is wont frequently to impoſe upon others, will here be found to be of no little ſervice: and from this conſideration we are enabled, in ſome meaſure, to account for the unrelenting violence with which they calumniate the Clergy, and revile the Eſtabliſhment.

As the Author of the Vindication has undertaken to juſtify the conduct of theſe men, from a particular paſſage in the third Epiſtle of St. John, we would obſerve thereon, that the words of the Apoſtle afford no ſanction, no pretext whatever, for the inquiſitorial uſurpation of theſe men over the minds and conſciences of the members of their reſpective claſſes. This Epiſtle is by no means to be conſidered as a catholic one; it is addreſſed to a private individual, who was the eſteemed friend of the Apoſtle; and the language adopted in the ſecond verſe is merely expreſſive of the benevolent wiſhes of the writer to

his beloved Gaius, that in bodily health, and in all his worldly concerns, he might, under the divine bleſſing, be made to ſucceed and proſper, even as *his ſoul had been made to proſper*, by the knowledge of the Goſpel, and the influence which its enlivening truths had already had upon his life and converſation. The verb Ευοδωμαι, we conſider in this paſſage, as having a ſignification ſimilar to that of the Hebrew verb in the conjugation Hiphil.

We have been thus copious in diſcuſſing the ſubject of the claſs meetings, becauſe here Mr. B. ſeems to reſt the chief part of his defence, and priding himſelf on the ſuppoſed ignorance of the reporters, as to the manner in which thoſe meetings have been conducted in the country, he conſiders himſelf as ſtanding upon vantage ground, and from thence, with a ſupercilious confidence, he bids defiance to his adverſaries. But enough, we truſt, has now been ſaid to convince our readers, that great, very great, abuſes do indeed prevail in this department of methodiſm, which loudly call for ſome legiſlative remedy.

(To be concluded in our next.)

A Journey from London to the Iſle of Wight. By Thomas Pennant, Eſq. 2. Vols. 4to. Pp. 424. 3l. 3s. Weſt and Hughes. 1801.

"THE merits of the late Mr. Pennant" (ſays the editor of theſe volumes) "as an author, are too well known to require encomium: his talents as a naturaliſt ſtand unrivalled; and, as a touriſt, he was the firſt who enlivened the dryneſs of topographical reſearch with hiſtorical and biographical anecdote, and illuſtrated deſcription with the decorations of the pencil. Several tours, thus recommended, were publiſhed during his life-time, and have gone through numerous editions; others, which he never printed, are enumerated, in his literary life; amongſt theſe ſtands conſpicuous the tour from *London* to *Dover*, and from *Dover* to the *Land's End*.

"In regard to the tour from *London* to *Dover*, which forms part of his great work on the outlines of the globe, he thus expreſſes himſelf: 'Vol. II. deſcribes a tour commencing at the *Temple Stairs*, comprehending my paſſage down the *Thames*, as low as *Dartford Creek*, and from thence to *Dover*.'

"The tour from *Dover*, which forms another part of his outlines of the globe, he thus deſcribes in page 31: 'ever ſince the year 1777, I had quite loſt my ſpirit of rambling. Another happy nuptial connection ſuppreſſed every deſire to leave my fire-ſide; but, in the ſpring of this year, I was induced once more to renew my journies. My ſon had returned from his laſt tour to the Continent, ſo much to my ſatisfaction, that I was determined to give him

him every advantage that might qualify him for a ſecond, which he was on the point of taking over the kingdoms of *France* and *Spain*. I wiſhed him to make a compariſon of the naval ſtrength and commercial advantages and diſadvantages of our iſland, with thoſe of her two powerful rivals: I attended him down the *Thames*, viſited all our docks, and, by land, (from *Dartford*) followed the whole coaſt to the very *Land's End*. On his return from his ſecond tour I had great reaſon to boaſt that this excurſion was not thrown away: as to myſelf, it was a painful one; long abſence from my family was ſo new to me, that, I may ſincerely ſay, it caſt an anxiety over the whole journey.

"The intereſt which every reader muſt feel in the deſcription and delineation of theſe portions of our iſle, will be greatly enhanced by the conſideration that this is among the poſthumous remains of that correct obſerver, and experienced inveſtigator, whoſe glance penetrated through all the receſſes of nature—whoſe taſte in embelliſhment and accuracy in deſcription, ſubjected to the eye; and indelibly impreſſed on the mind of his reader, thoſe images which were ſo happily conceived, and ſo intereſtingly blended in his own. This work is among the laſt treaſures drawn from that mine of learning and ſcience which the hand of providence has cloſed for ever—that mine by which our national treaſures have been copiouſly augmented, and from which ſome of the moſt eſtimable ornaments of Britiſh literature have been derived.

"Conſidering theſe tours are part of a grand unfiniſhed project, they preſent a model to that kindred genius who ſhall venture to perfect what PENNANT left incomplete. Conſidered as a fragment of an illuſtrious author, they will not want value in the eyes of his countrymen, as they diſplay that grand portion of the Britiſh territory where force, wealth, and that commerce from which both are derived, have fixed their chief, and, it is hoped immoveable reſidence.

"Theſe tours, now preſented to the public, were kindly communicated by David Pennant, Eſq. the ſon of the author. The editor has ſpared neither pains nor expence to render this work in all reſpects equal to Mr. Pennant's former publications: it is embelliſhed with forty-nine Plates, conſiſting of views of the moſt important places mentioned in the tour, and portraits of illuſtrious perſons.

"It is neceſſary to apprize the reader, that the manuſcript has been ſcrupulouſly adhered to, and that two or three breaks, left by Mr. Pennant, are not filled up. This conſcientious adherence to literary veracity will require no apology, the editor deſpaired of embelliſhing, and would not riſk diſfiguring the work of ſo excellent a hand."

This ſcrupulous adherence to the manuſcript is carried to a length that is truly ridiculous, as our readers will admit when they are told that the *breaks* which are left might eaſily be filled up by a child; for inſtance, in the account of Greenwich

wich Hoſpital, ſpeaking of the penſioners, the author ſays—"the number, at preſent amounts to"—to ſupply this omiſſion a reference to the books of the Hoſpital would have ſufficed, and the number might ſurely have been added without any riſk of *diſfiguring the work*. The other blanks are chiefly of the ſame nature, and the omiſſion to fill them up, of courſe, in our opinion, *does* require an apology.

Thoſe who are acquainted with Mr. Pennant's ſtyle of writing will know what they have to expect from the peruſal of theſe volumes; but, notwithſtanding the laudable partiality of the editor, they will not, we fear, afford that degree of gratification to the general reader, which might reaſonably be hoped from the paſt publications of this ingenious and well-informed writer.—The work is compoſed too much in the ſtyle of a journal, and contains too little novelty, to arreſt attention, communicate information, or even to ſupply amuſement. Still it is occaſionally intereſting, and our traveller has not failed to glean all that could poſſibly be collected from a field that had been ſo often viſited before.—We ſhall ſelect two or three paſſages as fair ſpecimens of the work.

NORFOLK HOSPITAL, GREENWICH.

"There are, in *Greenwich*, two hoſpitals of private foundation, I ſhall only mention that called *Norfolk*, which ſtands on the river-ſide, a little to the north-eaſt of the Royal Hoſpital. Notwithſtanding it was founded by *Henry Howard*, Earl of *Northampton*, yet it bears the title of his brother *Thomas*, Duke of *Norfolk*.—*Northampton* had the honour of founding two others, at *Clun* in *Shropſhire*, and at *Caſtleriſing* in *Norfolk*. He ſeemed to reſt entirely on a few good works, to expiate for a multitude of ſins, to compound with heaven for a life moſt enormouſly wicked: he was treacherous, diſſembling, mean, and cruel. The *Howards* muſt not boaſt of their blood in this corrupted ſtream. He is mentioned as *ſubtiliter ſubdolus*, and a cunning ſerpent; the groſſeſt flatterer alive; externally a Proteſtant, internally a Roman Catholic; adapting his religion to his conveniency. He enjoyed the higheſt honours of the times, yet could ſink into a pandar, and promote the intrigue between the favourite *Somerſet* and his own niece, wife to the injured Earl of *Eſſex*. To fill the meaſure of his iniquity, he perſuaded the murder of Sir *Thomas Overbury*, and fortunately for himſelf, died before the detection of that nefarious tranſaction.

"He had the hardineſs to proſecute, in the Star Chamber, certain perſons, who had been indiſcreet enough to ſay ſome ſevere truths of him. Sentence was about to be paſſed on them, when the honeſt Abbot, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, aroſe, and bluntly told the Court, that there were ſufficient grounds for the reports, and, pulling out a letter of the Earl's to Cardinal *Bellarmine*,

mine, read from his own confeſſion, 'that his conformity to the Proteſtant religion was no more than a compliment to the *King*, but his heart ſtood firm with the Papiſts; and that he would be ready to further them in any attempt.' His Lordſhip was ſo ſtruck with this, that he went home, made his will, confeſſed himſelf a Roman Catholic, and died ſoon after. As he was Warden of the *Cinque Ports*, and Governor of *Dover Caſtle*, he was buried there; and a ſuperb monument, made by *Stone*, at the expence of 500l. erected over him in the Chapel of the Caſtle: his figure is repreſented kneeling on a ſarcophagus, in the robes of the Garter, and with his hands claſped. His heirs ſeemed to have inherited his love of flattery; for, at each corner of the tomb, they have placed a figure of a cardinal virtue. His death happened on June 15th, 1614; in 1696, when the Chapel grew ruinous, his body and tomb were removed into the Chapel of the Hoſpital.

THE POWDER MAGAZINE AT PURFLEET.

"From *Erith*, we croſſed the river obliquely to *Purfleet*. Its great *chalk* hill roſe before us, in this flat country, like an *Alp*. A conſiderable quantity is burnt into lime for ſale. We landed at the tremendous national magazines of gun-powder, erected here about the year 1762. Before that time they were at *Greenwich*, which was thought to be too near our capital. They conſiſt of five large parallel buildings, each above a hundred and ſixty feet long, and fifty-two wide, five feet thick, arched beneath the flated roof; the arch is three feet in thickneſs, and the ridge of the roof covered with a coping of lead twenty-two inches broad. The building was reſerved for the reception of the barrels of powder brought out of the magazines, in order to be tried in the proof-room, to which there is a paſſage, with a railed floor, covered on the bottom with water; ſo that, ſhould any grain drop, no accident could ſet them on fire. At preſent this building is diſuſed, all the experiments being made in the open air, and in the muſquetry or artillery, to the uſe of which it is deſtined. All theſe buildings are ſurrounded, at a diſtance, with a lofty wall. In the two outmoſt is kept the powder, in ſmall barrels, piled within wooden frames, from the bottom to the roof; and between the frames is a platform of planks, that the walkers may go in without fear of ſtriking againſt any ſubſtance capable of emitting a ſpark. As a farther ſecurity, thoſe who enter this dreadful place are furniſhed with goloſhoes and a carter's frock. Nothing of iron is admitted, for fear of a fatal colliſion. The doors are of copper, the wheels of the barrows are of braſs. The four buildings uſually contain thirty thouſand barrels, of a hundred pounds weight. Should an exploſion take place, *London*, only fifteen miles diſtant in a direct line, would probably ſuffer in a high degree. The dread of ſuch an accident by lightning, ſtruck the *Board of Ordnance* ſo forcibly, that, in 1772, it conſulted the *Royal Society* on the moſt effectual method of preventing it. A Committee from the Society was appointed, who determined on fixing conductors; ſuch were ſet up with unuſual precaution.

caution. Theſe were, on the principle, adviſed by Dr. *Benjamin Franklin*. The very ſame philoſopher, who, living under the protection of our mild government, was ſecretly playing the incendiary, and too ſucceſsfully inflaming the minds of our fellow ſubjects in *America*, till the great exploſion happened, which for ever diſunited us from our once happy coloniſts. On May 15, 1777, the inefficacy of his pointed conductors was evinced: lightning ſtruck off ſeveral pieces of ſtone and brick from the coping of the *Board-houſe*, which ſtands at a ſmall diſtance from the Magazines; neither the conductor on this houſe, or any of the others, acted; but Providence directed the ſtroke to that alone; the miſchief was very trifling. Mr. B. *Wilſon* had very ably diſſented againſt the method propoſed by Dr. *Franklin*; but the evil genius of the witty philoſopher ſtood victorious, and our capital narrowly eſcaped ſubverſion. At preſent theſe important Magazines are made as ſafe as human wiſdom can contrive. The houſe in queſtion is a handſome plain building, and is called the *Board Houſe*, from the uſe made occaſionally of it by the *Board of Ordnance*. It commands a fine view up and down the river, and the rich gentle range of hills in the county of Kent."

QUEEN ELIZABETH AT TILBURY.

" Elizabeth was ſuperior to every weakneſs but that of love. (Surely the author ſhould have excepted *vanity* alſo, nor have wholly omitted her *vices*, which, unfortunately, were numerous.) " She viſited the camp in perſon, rode from rank to rank, and animated her troops by the moſt inſpiriting ſpeeches.

" As I am now on the ſpot, I ſhall mention the part of one, as the moſt animated of any which ever really fell from the mouth of an heroine. She has been compared to a *Deborah*, a *Boadicea*, and a *Zenobia*. Had her Highneſs been put to the proof, her deeds might have not been leſs celebrated! But I queſtion whether any one of them confirmed their reſolves with ſo round a period as did the daughter of our bluff Monarch, in whom, on this occaſion, his ſpirit fully burſt forth. She alludes to the cowardly deſertion of the country at the appearance of the *Armada*, by ſeveral of the gentry who lived on the coaſt. " I underſtand," ſays ſhe, " that numbers of the gentry have quitted their ſeats on the ſight of the enemy: ſhould they ever again betray the like want of courage, by G-d I will make them know what it is to be fearful on ſo urgent an occaſion!!!

THE CHURCH OF ST. NICHOLAS AT BRIGHTON.

On an altar-tomb, near the ſouth ſide of the Church, is the following memorial of the loyalty and ſervices of *Nicholas Tatterſal*, maſter of the ſmall bark, which, in defiance of all danger, conveyed *Charles* II. ſafe to *France*. That prince, after experiencing a long ſeries of miraculous eſcapes ſubſequent to the battle of *Worceſter*, was at length conducted by his faithful friends to *Brighthelmſtone*, which was thought a more ſecure place to meet at, than at *Shoreham*, where

where his veſſel lay. His Majeſty was immediately known by *Tatterſal*; for it ſeems he had been taken by the King when Prince, with his own and ſeveral other veſſels belonging to this town in 1648. The man behaved with unſhaken loyalty, and conveying him to *Shorebam*, ſet ſail on October 16, and landed him in the night, in a creek not far from *Feſcamp* in *Normandy*.

Captain *Nicholas Tatterſal*, through whoſe prudence, valour, and loyalty, *Charles* II. King of England, after he had eſcaped the ſword of his mercileſs rebels, and his forces receiv'd a fatal overthrow at *Worceſter*, September the 3d, 1651, was faithfully preſerved, and conveyed to *France*, departed this life the 26th of July, 1674.

"Within this marble monument doth lie,
Approved faith, honour, and loyalty;
In this cold clay he has now ta'en up his ſtation,
Who once preſerv'd the Church, the Crown, and Nation:
When *Charles* the Great was nothing but a breath,
This valiant ſoul ſtept 'tween him and death:
Uſurpers' threats, nor tyrant rebels' frown,
Could not affright his duty to the Crown:
Which glorious act of his for Church and State
Three Princes in one day did gratulate,
Profeſſing all to him in debts to be,
As all the world are to his memory.
Since earth could not reward the worth him given,
He now receives it from the King of Heaven.
In the ſame cheſt one jewel more you have,
The partner of his virtues, bed, and grave."

"Soon after the Reſtoration, *Tatterſal* broughthis veſſel up the river *Thames*, and moored oppoſite to *Whitehall*, in remembrance of his Majeſty's eſcape. An annuity was granted to that loyal ſailor, and his heirs for ever, of 100l. a year; but for a conſiderable time paſt it has been diſcontinued."

It is worthy of enquiry, how an annuity ſo ſettled, and *for ſuch a purpoſe*, came to be diſcontinued. The *Regium Donum* to the deſcendants of the men who murdered the father of the prince, whoſe life this gallant tar contributed to preſerve, continues to be paid with wonderful punctuality.

The plates are well executed; and the greater part of the deſigns diſplay much taſte. A Northern Tour, from *Downing* to *Alſton Moor*, by Mr. Pennant, is, we find, in the preſs.

A Collation of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Pſalms: in order to account for the Variances *between them, and thereby eſtabliſh the Authenticity of the one, and the Fidelity of the other.* By John Reeves, Eſq. 8vo. Pp. 286. Price 8s. Payne, White, Wright. 1800.

WE

WE have already had frequent occaſion to commend the *conſtitutional* labours of Mr. Reeves. We are now called upon to put off our ſandals, and meet him upon *holy* ground; a taſk the more agreeable, becauſe it will not *here* be our lot *incedere per ignes ſuppoſitos cineri doloſo*. Hitherto we have been obliged to accompany him with circumſpection, and to meaſure our paces with caution; but here we ſhall be at liberty to look about and loiter, without having occaſion for the ſweet ſound of flutes and recorders, *to charm our painful ſteps over the burning marl*.

The Collation is prefaced by a learned letter to Mr. Pitt, of *ſixty-four* pages, explanatory of the author's deſign in the work itſelf. The publication of the Holy Scriptures being one of the employments of *the King's Printer*, and Mr. Reeves having an intereſt in that concern, he has determined to be inſtrumental in editing ſuch biblical works as ſhall be uſeful, not only to Engliſh readers, but to ſcholars. Feeling the reſponſibility of his ſituation, he is laudably actuated by the deſire of "doing ſomething for the public, and of paying the debt, which a great man has ſaid, we all owe to our profeſſion." As his preliminary epiſtle is of ſome importance, we ſhall review it with attention, and take the liberty of diſapproving, as well as commending, where we think we have juſt occaſion.

The Septuagint tranſlation of the *Pſalms* is, in our opinion, juſtly appreciated by Mr. R.: but we cannot conſent, that the ſame merit ſhould be extended to *much the greater part* of the Greek verſion. Has he compared the book of *Job* with the Hebrew? Has he collated the prophecies of *Iſaiah* with the original? With Biſhop Lowth's ſentiments of the latter, we cannot ſuppoſe him to be unacquainted. Has he marked the deficiencies of the Greek tranſlation of *Jeremiah?* Is he aware, that there is a paſſage in that book, which the incapable tranſlator gave up as inexplicable, and inſerted the Hebrew in Greek letters in his verſion, notwithſtanding the ſenſe was obvious and eaſy? We cannot point to the paſſage, for *Trommius* affords no reference to it, but of its exiſtence there cannot be the ſhadow of a doubt. Michaelis's ſentiments on the excellence of ſome parts of the Greek verſion, and particularly of the book of *Proverbs*, we have been long acquainted with; but we muſt beg leave to ſubjoin our own ſentiments, that other parts are extremely defective: ſo defective, as not to warrant the concluſion that the Greek verſion, as we have received it, was, in *all* its parts, the work of *ſeventy-two* able and competent interpreters, ſelected for the purpoſe. We ſpeak from experience, and we are confident that Mr. R. will

not

not deſpiſe the teſtimony founded on ſuch a baſis. We again ſpeak from experience, when we deny that the Hebrew language is extremely imperfect, *without the addition of points*. Our judgment on the utility of points, as well as on the relative value of the Greek verſion, has been admirably anticipated by Biſhop Lowth, in the introduction to his *Iſaiah*. Accurate as that great man was at all times, he has no where given a more ſtriking proof of the clearneſs and preciſion which accompanied all his remarks, than in calculating the merits of the Septuagint, and of the Maſoretic reading. Mr. R. appears to be ſomewhat too warmly attached to both. He looks upon the Septuagint verſion in particular, as a work of the higheſt importance, as a verſion which *fixes the words and ſenſe of Scripture* at a period full 700 years, and, according to ſome accounts, 1,100 years earlier than the Maſorites *fixed* it by their method of pointing. Experience, we have ſaid, has taught us to recoil at the idea of aſſigning to any particular period, the *whole* of the Greek verſion which we at preſent poſſeſs. We queſtion not the authenticity of the tale of Ptolemy Philadelphus, but the genuineneſs of various parts of the tranſlation. It is true, that reference is made to it by the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles in the writings of the New Teſtament. They ſometimes quote from it; and wherever they have honoured it by their citations, its character muſt be allowed to be eſtabliſhed. But it is alſo true, that the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles have ſometimes rejected the Greek verſion, and appealed in preference to the Hebrew. Hence we conclude, that it is not right to rely altogether on the Greek verſion, as a ſtandard which is to *fix the words and ſenſe of Scripture*. If the early Fathers had only the Greek verſion in uſe among them, we do not think that Mr. Reeves can found upon that circumſtance an incontrovertible proof, that the Greek verſion was all-ſufficient without the knowledge of the Hebrew. If they acquieſced in the Greek upon all occaſions, and did not exert themſelves to learn the original language of the ſacred writings, how could they be capable of *judging* the Greek verſion to be *fully ſufficient for all the purpoſes of their pious labours*?

When we make uſe of theſe remarks, we would not be underſtood to entertain a mean opinion of the utility of the labours of Mr. R. We ſincerely applaud that curioſity which led him to enquire what was *the real extent of the diſcordance between the Greek and Hebrew texts*, by making an exact *collation* of the Pſalms. We ſhould rejoice to ſee a collation of the ſame nature, extended by him to the whole *maſs* of ſcripture. But we cannot help entertaining ſome doubt of the advantage to be derived from ſuffering *a perſon of the Jewiſh nation* to be the companion of ſuch ſtudies. Though extremely well

well verſed in the ſcriptures, and in all parts of Jewiſh learning, ſuch an aſſiſtant would to *us* be a guide, of whom we ſhould never deem ourſelves unreaſonably ſuſpicious.

Preſuming that the Septuagint tranſlators were anxious to be ſtrictly faithful, and were fully competent to the taſk which they undertook, Mr. R. concludes, that wherever diſcordance appears in the Book of Pſalms, it muſt be owing to ſome change in one of the texts; and ſuch change he feels himſelf obliged to ſuppoſe, has rather taken place in the Hebrew than in the Greek. We do not deny the poſſibility of ſuch change, but we hope that the time is far diſtant, when it ſhall be thought judicious and ſafe, to correct the Hebrew text by ſo dangerous a criterion. Fallibility is entirely on the ſide of the tranſlators; and there can be no authenticity in inſpired writers, if we compel them to ſpeak only what their moſt ancient interpreters have fancied them to ſpeak.

"What prerogative," ſays Mr. Reeves, "can belong to an original ſo incompletely written as the Hebrew, when brought into competition with a finiſhed language like the Greek." Is there not an appearance of *undue partiality* in this ſentiment? Is there not the ſame appearance, when Mr. R. declares, that the removal of a ſingle letter in the Hebrew text will often make ſenſe of *what before was nonſenſe*, or make ſome other ſenſe *juſt as natural as the one conveyed by it before?* Is not the ſame appearance to be again found, where Mr. R. declares, that, after conſidering the different capacities of theſe two witneſſes, we cannot *heſitate in giving a preference* to that which ſeems to have *the higheſt pretenſion to credit*, and that is *the Greek?* We allow that Hebrew, without points, is a kind of *ſhort-hand*; it has the conciſeneſs of *algebra*; but, like *algebra*, it is not the more obſcure for being conciſe. Its ſenſe is not often ambiguous and doubtful: but may eaſily be made ſo by thoſe who, *to preſerve a meaning, confide it to a ſingle point.*

After theſe and other proofs of undue partiality, we were pleaſed to meet with the following more correct deciſion on the value of the Maſoretic points, which nearly coincides with the opinion of Biſhop Lowth.

"I beg the zealous advocates for the Hebrew text to conſider, that whatever may be urged in favour of the radical letters of the preſent text, it never can be maintained that the *vowel points* have an equal pretenſion; *they are certainly no part of Scripture*; they are only *evidence of an ancient reading* of Scripture; as ſuch they *are reſpectable, and highly ſo* in my opinion; *but not more ſo, than other teſtimonies of learned men.*" P. 37.

This is ſound and liberal criticiſm, to which we heartily ſubſcribe. We as heartily applaud Mr. R. for his good intention

tention of vindicating the fidelity of the Greek tranſlators. We are as anxious as he is, that the bibilical ſtudent ſhould conſult more frequently his ſeptuagint. We conſider it as a very valuable witneſs to the true ſenſe of the original Scriptures. They who have been at the pains to acquaint themſelves with the Hebrew, ought neither to deſpiſe the Greek, nor to rely implicitly on the Maſoretic reading. The Greek and Hebrew ſchools ſhould, undoubtedly, unite in allowing *a proportionate ſhare of credit to both texts.* They certainly, as Mr. R. has ſtated, reflect a mutual light upon each other.—Such light it ſhould be the buſineſs of the ſtudent carefully to collect into one focus, that it may be applied to the effectual illuſtration of the *naked letter* of the law and the prophets.

We ſhall not follow Mr. R. through his hiſtory of the Greek and other verſions of the Scriptures. We ſhall only notice, that his obſervation on the tranſlation of the pſalms in our Church Bible, is very juſt: that it is *leſs known* than any part of our verſion of the Holy Scriptures. This is very properly aſcribed, to the retention of the old verſion of the pſalms taken from Cranmer's bible; which, from ſcruples of delicacy, has never been removed from our common prayer book. That the verſion in the Church Bible is the moſt faithful, every ſcholar, acquainted with the original, muſt admit. We are, however, of the number of thoſe, who do not wiſh to ſee it take place of the verſion ſtill in uſe. Mr. R. ſhall charge us, if he pleaſes, with being *prepoſſeſſed* in favour of the common prayer pſalms, in conſequence of having heard them repeated in the Church ſervice from our youth. In the ſame manner have we heard, and ſtill hear, but without giving them ſimilar preference, the ludicrous ſtaves of Sternhold and Hopkins. Indeed, we ſuſpect that there is ſomething more than the ſpell of prejudice upon us. At the peril of being reproved by Mr. R. for deficiency in taſte and the love of accuracy, we cannot refrain from acknowledging, that we are under the influence of a very obſtinate opinion, that *the language and ſtyle* of the old Pſalter, is indeed, in very many inſtances, highly *poetical and elegant.* The tranſlator of the bible pſalms was equal to his taſk; he rendered the original *faithfully,* but he alſo rendered it *coldly.* He caught none of the fire and ardent ſpirit of devotion, which animated his author. No ſuch defect appears in his venerable predeceſſor. On the contrary, ſuch is the ſpirit with which he renders the original, that he may not only be ſaid to follow the Hebrew in many inſtances *paſſibus æquis,* but in ſome parts has even gone beyond it, and expreſſed himſelf in language rather too bold for an interpreter. Mr. R. obſerves that thoſe pſalms do not repreſent

the "Hebrew text, nor the Septuagint, nor any one ſingle text. They ſeem to have ſomething from all, and ſomething from the compilers; who finiſhed them according to their own fancy, and no doubt with a view to their effect in the ſervice." This is a ſevere ſentence, but truth accompanies it. It is not to be applied *univerſally* to the old verſion; but there are paſſages, where it will be difficult to prove that Mr. R. is miſtaken. *View to effect* was, however, pardonable; and we fear, were our old anthems to be rejected, and were new ones to be compoſed from the Bible verſion of the pſalms, there would be a lamentable difference, between the nerve and energy of the one, and the tameneſs and inſipidity of the other.

Mr. Reeves cloſes his letter to Mr. Pitt, with an account of books which he intends hereafter to publiſh. His firſt object is a good *octavo* edition of the *Church Bible*; in which he purpoſes to combine utility and beauty, in a degree which has not yet been experienced. We preſume, if *utility* is one of his motives, that his Bible will not be deſtitute of the *marginal references*; which are extremely valuable, and the want of which is a great drawback on the merits of Macklin. We hope alſo, that to *beauty* will be added a *reaſonable price*. For ſhould Mr. R. aſk for his *Bible* a ſum proportionate to that which he has fixed on his *Collation*, he will neither benefit the herd of readers, nor himſelf. He will excuſe us for obſerving, that *eight ſhillings* for *eighteen ſheets* is not warranted by the preſent dearth of paper. It is almoſt equal to the price of *newſpapers*; which are compoſed with a much greater proportion of labour, and pay a very heavy tax alſo. At the ſame rate of charging, our Review would ſell for *three ſhillings and ſixpence* inſtead of *two ſhillings*. So great an addition to the *fair* price of the book, is not to be juſtified, even by the ſuperior *accuracy* manifeſted in its Hebrew and Greek quotations: though the latter invariably deſerves our warmeſt and moſt unqualified approbation. The publication which is to follow the above, Mr. R. has thus announced.

"After this tribute to the Engliſh reader, I feel a deſire to furniſh ſome work, which may unite learning with religion, and be uſeful to the clergyman and the ſcholar: I mean ſome work, which will bring together, into one view, *the original texts of Scripture*, and their approved verſions, *the Septuagint and Vulgate*, together with *our own Church tranſlation*: a work that may facilitate a critical examination of all theſe texts."

It is, therefore, Mr. R's. deſign to furniſh us with an *Engliſh, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin* bible, after the manner of Walton's Polyglott. We ſincerely wiſh him ſucceſs in ſuch

an

an undertaking; and congratulate ourſelves and the public upon the fair proſpect which we have, of its being a work not unworthy of the King's Printer. As to its ſucceſs, we can only entertain lively hopes, proportioned to the reſpect in which our Engliſh Verſion is ſtill held. Mr. R. has obſerved, that *no book has the ſame ſort of regular and general ſale*; and we can aſſure our readers, that the *groſs* return made to *one* of our univerſities, for *bibles and common prayer books*, does not average at leſs than twenty thouſand pounds per annum. *(To be continued.)*

Oratio in Theatro Collegii Regalis Medicorum Londinenſis ex Harveii Inſtituto Habita die Oct. 18, *An.* 1800. Ab Henrico Vaughan, M. D. Medico Regio Extraordinario. Lond. White, Fleet-ſtreet.

A NEAT and appropriate oration on the occaſion, dedicated to Dr. Giſborne, the Preſident. It contains juſt and elegant praiſes of Linacre, Harvey, Sydenham, Friend, and Mead. We ſhall quote part of the concluſion, as doing juſtice to the character of one whoſe merits will be atteſted by many living witneſſes, the late Dr. Warren.

" Jàm vero naturali quodam Orationis curſu ad noſtra ferè tempora pervenimus; tempora, profectò, quæ, uteunque aliis ex partibus, iniquitatibus rerum atque hominùm ineptiis ſatis, et pluſquàm ſatis, laborare videantur, Medicinæ tamen ſimplici iſti atque legitimæ veteris dignitatis nihil imminuerunt. Habuimus certè vel noſtris oculis obverſatos, immò habemus etiamnùm, de quibus, ſivè ingenii acumen, ſive literarum copiam intueamur, ſummo jure gloriari poſſumus. Etenìm, ut ad eum me convertam quem intra triennium deſideravimus, ecquis erat unquam ſcientiâ morborum locupletatus magìs, vel magìs curatione exercitatus; ecquis erat unquam quì ſuavi illâ ſermonis et morum humanitate, quæ in ipſo remediorum loco haberi poteſt, ecquis erat unquam qui Warrenum ſuperabat? Erat illi ingenii vis maxuma, perceptio et comprehenſio celerrima, judicium acre, memoria perceptorum tenaciſſima. Meminiſtis, Socii, quam ſubtilitèr, et uno quaſi intuitu res omnes ægrotantium perſpiceret penitùs et intelligeret! in interrogando quam aptus eſſet et opportunus, quam promptus in expediendo! Omnia etenìm artis ſubſidia ſtatim illi in mentem veniebant, et nihil ei novum, nihil inauditum videbatur.—In eâ autem facultate quâ conſolamur afflictos et deducimus perterritos a timore, quâ languidos incitamus, et erigimus depreſſos, omnium Medicorum facilè princeps fuit; et ſi qui medicamentis non ceſſiſſent dolores, permulcebat eos et conſopiebat hortationibus et alloquio.

. . . . . ſtetit urna paulùm
Sicca, dum grato Danai puellas
Carmine mulcet. HOR.

Verùm ea eſt quodammodo artis noſtræ conditio, ut Medicus quamvis ſit eruditus, quamvis ſit acer et acutus in cogitando, quamvis ſit ad præcipiendum expeditus, ſi fuerit idem in moribus ac voluntatibus civium ſuorum hoſpes, parum ei proderit oleum operamque inter calamos et ſcrinia conſumpſiſſe. Warrenus autem in omni vitæ et ſtudiorum decurſu, ſi quis unquam alius, Pallade dextrâ uſus eſt, atque omnium quibuſcum rem agebat mentes ſenſuſque guſtavit; et quid ſentirent, quid vellent, quid opinarentur, quid expectarent arripuit, percepit, novit. Tantam denique morum comitatem et facilitatem habuit, ut nemo eo ſemèl uſus eſſet Medico, quin ſocium voluerit et amicum."

POLITICS.

Letters of Sulpicius on the Northern Confederacy. With an Appendix, containing the Treaty of Armed Neutrality, together with other Documents relative to the Subject. 8vo. Pp. 72. Cobbett. Pall-Mall. 1801.

THESE Letters firſt appeared in a daily paper, The Porcupine, and the demand for them was ſo great, that the proprietor of that paper very wiſely formed the determination to reprint them in the form of a pamphlet. We are not in the leaſt ſurpriſed that they ſhould have excited ſo much attention, ſince they embrace a queſtion of the firſt importance to the political and commercial ſtate of this country, which is diſcuſſed with a degree of ability, and a ſtrength of argument, that carry conviction along with them. The mind, that, after the peruſal of theſe ſheets, can entertain a doubt of the exiſtence of a right in belligerent powers to ſearch the ſhips of Neutral States bound to an enemy's port, under a well-founded ſuſpicion of their being employed for the conveyance of warlike ſtores, muſt be perverſeneſs itſelf. The principle of public law, the point of juſtice and equity, and the uniform practice of maritime States, are clearly and fully expounded; and the documents annexed form a valuable addition to the Letters. Our very exiſtence, as a commercial nation, depends, as much as upon any other point whatever, on our maintenance and aſſertion of this clearly-eſtabliſhed right; and we had better encounter the dangers of a war with the whole world, than ſuffer ourſelves to be intimidated into a baſe reſignation of it.

An Eſtimate of the Number of Inhabitants in Great Britain and Ireland. By Sir Frederick Morton Eden, Bart. 8vo. Pp. 94. 2s. 6d. Wright. 1800.

THE perfect competency of Sir F. Eden to diſcuſs any ſubject of political economy, or political arithmetic, cannot be queſtioned by any one who has the ſmalleſt acquaintance either with him or his works. The difference which has appeared in the accounts of dif-

ferent

ferent writers on the very intereſting topic of the population of the country, from Davenant to Price and from Price to Beeke, may, perhaps, be more juſtly referred to the different data which have conſtituted the baſis of their calculations, than to any want of care or to any wiſh to miſlead. Dr. Beeke, whoſe able letter to a county Member was reviewed in a former Number of our work, eſtimated the population of Great Britain much higher than any former writer; and Sir F. Eden, who has conſulted every preceding writer, after much deep inveſtigation, much attentive conſideration, and much able diſquiſition, is of opinion that the population of the United Empire of Great Britain and Ireland amounts to no leſs than 16,510,000, allowing to Ireland 3,800,000; and to Scotland 1,500,000 which we incline to think is conſiderably underrated. The author's calculations ſeem to be founded on ſolid data; and he makes it appear that the increaſe of population in the laſt century was progreſſive and regular. This muſt be a ſource of heart-felt ſatisfaction to every Briton who feels as a Briton ought to feel.

Our author laughs at thoſe political economiſts who "gravely lament that great cities are inimical to the multiplication of the ſpecies and that a devouring metropolis drains the country of its inhabitants." But, notwithſtanding this rebuke, we ſhall continue to lament the increaſing extent of this overgrown capital, not as political economiſts, from an opinion that it is inimical to the multiplication of the ſpecies, (though it remain to be proved that it is not ſo, for which purpoſe, we think, it will be neceſſary to demonſtrate the nutritious qualities of filth and Gin), but, as moraliſts, from a conviction that it tends to increaſe profligacy and corruption of every kind, together with a total contempt of all religious and ſocial duties.

We fully agree with Sir F. in the fact, and a moſt important fact it is, "that our agricultural pariſhes are better ſtocked than they were an hundred years ago;"—but when he tells us, that then "the *viſionary evils* aſcribed to the exiſtence of commercial and agricultural capitaliſts did not exiſt," we cannot reſiſt the temptation of aſking him, *when* VISIONARY evils *did* exiſt?

All doubts reſpecting the extent of our population will very ſoon be removed by the operation of the late act; though great accuracy on ſuch a ſubject cannot be expected. It would, we conceive, have been more effectual, and more eaſily executed, if it had compelled every houſholder throughout the kingdom, under a certain penalty, to deliver, on a given day, to the Overſeer, or other Officer, of the pariſh, a ſtatement of the number of perſons who ſlept under his roof the preceding night. This operation would have been equally ſimple, intelligible, and effective, which is far from being the caſe, with the regulations which the Legiſlature have thought proper to enact. But until the reſult of their labours ſhall have been aſcertained, we ſhall ſatisfy ourſelves, and we have no doubt that our readers will alſo be ſatisfied, with the conſolatory reflections with which this judicious writer concludes his intereſting tract.

"The population of France and her dependents, the Batavian

Republic, and Spaniſh Monarchy, ſhould not appal us, whilſt our enemies are beſieged at home by our fleets, which blockade their ports from the Texel to Gibraltar, and the Britiſh Empire is protected by a military force of half a million of men. "Theſe are the ſubſtance, ſinews, arms, and ſtrength" of this "Heaven-protected iſle:"—whilſt ſhe poſſeſſes ſuch means of defence, her arts and induſtry, her colonies and her commerce, will continue to flouriſh, and her inhabitants live proſperous and free.

"At the cloſe of the laſt century, Davenant made the following remark on our population; taking it at 5,500,000, according to Gregory King's eſtimate, (which is confeſſedly low), and eſtimating the quantity of land, in England and Wales, at 39,000,000 of Acres, (which is probably near the truth), he ſays, "we ſeem now to have about $7\frac{1}{4}$ acres per head; but there are many reaſons to think, that England is capable of nouriſhing double its preſent number of people, which ſuppoſing them now to be 5,500,000, would be 11,000,000, and even then there will be as many acres per head, as they have in Holland. And, when we have this complement of men, either in the natural courſe of time, or ſooner, by the help of good conduct, we ſhall be in a ſtate of power to deal with any ſtrength in Europe." That we have attained "this complement of men" cannot admit of much doubt; that we are "in a ſtate of power to deal with any ſtrength in Europe," has been proved by our exertions in the preſent awful conteſt; and I truſt we ſhall long continue, what we now are,

"A land, that diſtant tyrants hate in vain."

Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, on the Subject of the late Common Halls, for petitioning his Majeſty to aſſemble his Parliament for the Purpoſe of conſidering the High Price of Proviſions. By a Liveryman. 8vo. Pp. 30. Downes. 1801.

THIS Liveryman appears to be well acquainted with the nature and compoſition of thoſe licentious meetings ycleped Common Halls, as well as with the true character and principles of the preſent worthy Chief Magiſtrate of the city of London. If his remarks be not very profound, they are very juſt; and if his language be not very correct, it is very pointed. What he wants in accuracy he makes up in loyalty. He aſſures us that he recognized at the late Common Halls the ſame faces which he had formerly ſeen at "the meetings at Chalk Farm, Copenhagen-Houſe, Palace-Yard, and Thelwall's lecture-rooms." To the needy patriots of this deſcription he gives ſome wholeſome advice, to which it is heartily to be wiſhed that they would attend, as their families would unqueſtionably experience the benefits of ſuch attention. This pamphlet is profeſſedly *anonymous*, yet we ſuſpect that the author's name is viſible, even in the title-page,—to the *Critic's* eye.

MISCEL-

MISCELLANIES.

An historical and practical Essay on the Culture and Commerce of Tobacco. By William Tatham. Vernor and Hood. London. 1800.

WHETHER the advantages which have been produced by the introduction of tobacco into Europe more than counterbalance the evils which followed in its train, is a question which it would be no easy task to decide. But the great capital, and the numerous hands employed by our merchants and manufacturers in the tobacco trade, have certainly raised it to great importance in a commercial view; while the great revenue which it produces to the state give it no less importance as an article of political œconomy. The present publication, then, on the *culture and commerce of tobacco*, will, doubtless, prove interesting to those merchants and manufacturers who are engaged in the tobacco trade, and to those persons who wish to be informed about this particular branch of commerce and agriculture. The author appears to have paid great attention to the culture of tobacco, and, having resided in Virginia, where that culture is so well understood, he had the best opportunity of accurate information: his facts, therefore, may be depended on. Much of their interest will, no doubt, be lost in Britain, where no tobacco is raised; but to the Virginians, whose riches, in a great measure, depend upon that plant, they will, doubtless, prove very interesting. The book consists entirely in an account of the mode of cultivating the tobacco plant, in Virginia; of the method of packing it up, after it is ripe, in order to transport it across the Atlantic; and of the duties to which tobacco, imported into Britain, is liable. We shall present our readers with a short abridgement of it for their amusement and instruction; taking the liberty, at the same time, of altering the arrangement, and of omitting what we consider as of little importance, or not connected with the subject.

Tobacco was cultivated by the Virginian Indians long before they had any intercourse with Europeans. Our author, after considerable search, could not succeed in finding the plant growing wild in that country. Hence he conjectures, that it is not a native of Virginia, and that it was brought originally from the more southern parts of the Continent of America, probably by the Chackaw and Chickasaw nations, who seem to be descended from the Thascalans, and to have migrated to the eastward of the Mississippi, soon after the conquest of Mexico, by the Spaniards. The first accounts of it appear to have been brought to Britain by Sir John Hawkins, in 1565. Sir Walter Raleigh introduced it into England, about the year 1585. It was first imported into Spain from *Tobaco*, a province of Yucatan, whence its common name, *tobacco*. Repeated attempts had been made, by Sir Walter Raleigh, to form a settlement in Virginia, but none of them succeeded. Tobacco, however, had been gradually introduced into Britain as a medicine or luxury; for, in 1606, King James I. laid a duty of six shillings the pound upon it in order to put a final stop to its consumption.

In 1606 two companies of adventurers were established, under the names of the London and Plymouth companies; and they formed the first permanent settlement in Virginia. The planters applied themselves immediately to the cultivation of tobacco, which was soon raised, in considerable quantities, and imported into Britain. In consequence of the attention constantly paid to the culture of this plant, and the wise regulations formed by the Virginia planters, their tobacco soon acquired a superior reputation, which it still continues to enjoy. The botanical name of tobacco is *nicotiana*. It was thus named from *Iean Nicot*, ambassador from Francis II. to Sebastian, King of Portugal; because that gentleman first brought it to France. The species cultivated is the *tabacum*, an annual plant, with large lanceolate leave; there are many varieties of it, but our author, who is no botanist, does not pretend to give any description of them.

Tobacco requires a rich soil. The Virginia planter prefers land in its natural uncultivated state. He cuts down the trees with which it is covered, and rails in a sufficient quantity of it for his purpose. In March or April, beds, previously prepared, are sown with tobacco seed, usually mixed with lettuce seed, and a border of white mustard is often sown round the bed to protect the young tobacco plants from a caterpillar, which, without this precaution, would prove very destructive. The caterpillar prefers the mustard, and therefore never attacks the tobacco while any mustard remains. From these beds the plants are transplanted, on the first favourable season that occurs, between the beginning of April and June. The ground intended for their reception has been carefully dug up, with hoes, and formed into loose hillocks, each as high as a man's knee, and their centres are from three to four feet distant from each other, a tobacco plant is planted on the top of each of these hillocks. The time pitched upon for planting is always during a shower of rain, because the plants do not succeed well if the ground be dry. During the whole of the season the planters are busily employed in keeping the ground perfectly clean, and in turning it over frequently, that the earth may lie loosely around the plants. After the plants have arrived at a certain size, the planters rip off the lop of each, leaving only from five to nine leaves on every plant, according to their respective vigour. This operation is performed by the finger and thumb, and the Virginia planters allow the nail of their thumb to grow long for the purpose. The remaining leaves become stronger and require greater flavour: in like manner all the small shoots which make their appearance, at the origin of the leaves, are nipt off. When the plants are ripe, which is judged of by the size and firmness of the leaves, and by their yellowish green colour, they are cut down, almost by the root, with a sharp knife. After remaining on the field till they become so pliable that they can be handled without danger of breaking, they are carried into a large open house, like those used in this country for drying paper, where they are hung upon poles and kept to dry slowly. If the weather be moist, small fires are kindled in different part of the floor to promote the drying. When the plants are so far dried that no moisture can be

squeeze

squeezed out of the leaves, though they continue soft and pliable, they are taken down. The leaves are stripped off the stem, each of them are neatly rolled up into a bundle, and they are all piled up above each other in a heap. In this situation they become hot, and sweat, and seem to undergo a kind of fermentation. After this, they are squeezed into hogsheads. The hogsheads are so very well packed, that each of them contains 1000lbs. weight of tobacco, and often more. These hogsheads are then conveyed to the public warehouses, where all tobacco, before it can be exposed to sale, must undergo the inspection of certain men appointed for the purpose. If the tobacco be found good, a note is delivered to the proprietor specifying its quantity and quality. This note he consigns over to the merchant who purchases the tobacco, who has only to show it at the public warehouse in order to get the goods. These notes, indeed, go current in Virginia just as our bank notes do here. For tobacco, in that country, is often used as a medium of exchange instead of money. If the tobacco is of a bad quality, it is publicly burnt, by order of the inspector. If it be partly good and partly bad, the good is carefully separated and re-packed, but the bad is burnt. The skill which those negroes, who have been accustomed to the business, display in managing the tobacco-casks, and in hoisting them on board the vessels destined to carry them to Europe, is very great.

The tobacco is usually carried down the great rivers in flat-bottomed boats, called *skids*, and from them shipped on board the European vessels. The whole of the tobacco exported pays a certain duty to the American states. By the present laws, no tobacco can be imported into Britain, except from the British colonies in America, the United States of America, Spain, Portugal, and Ireland. It can be imported only in British vessels, and three-fourths of the crew at least must be subjects of Britain, or of the United States. Each cask of tobacco imported cannot weigh less than 450lbs. Tobacco can only be brought into the ports of London, Bristol, Liverpool, Lancaster, Cowes, Falmouth, Whitehaven, Hull, Port Glasgow, Greenock, Leith, and Newcastle upon Tyne. The regulations respecting the importers of tobacco are, doubtless, interesting to those concerned, but they are too numerous to be inserted here, and do not, from their nature, admit of abridgement. We must, therefore, refer the reader to the book itself.

The quantity of tobacco imported annually into Britain is very great; in the year 1798, for instance, it amounted to above forty millions of pounds weight. The number of ships, laden with tobacco, which arrived that year in the port of London, amounted to seventy-two. A great part of this quantity, however, is again exported; for instance, the quantity of tobacco imported, in 1796, 23,608,775lbs. the quantity of this delivered out for home consumption, was only 11,490,446lbs. the duty paid for which, to government, amounted to 287,252l. 11s. Such is a short abstract of the contents of this publication, but sufficient, we hope, to enable the reader to form some tolerable judgement of its nature and importance

tance. As a book, containing accurate information, collected with care and industry, it undoubtedly ranks high; but when we consider it as a literary production, it is by no means entitled to the same praises. The author has not been sufficiently accustomed to the art of writing, to be able to arrange his materials in their proper order, or to express himself with ease and perspicuity. His descriptions are in general, too tedious and minute, while those characterestic circumstances are often omitted, which serve to communicate precise ideas better than the most prolix narrative. Mistakes in grammar too, and extraordinary words and phrases, to which British ears are not accustomed, and probably of American growth, are not infrequent.* These faults ought to be attended to and corrected, in case of a second edition. In a work of this nature, intended solely for instruction, they may, perhaps, be more readily pardoned, but they ought never to be neglected by any person who wishes to procure readers.

A Maximum; or the Rise and Progress of Famine. Addressed to the British People. By the Author of "A Residence in France," during the Years 1792, 3, 4, 5, &c. &c. 8vo. Pp. 66. 1s. 6d. Wright. London. 1801.

THOSE persons who have recommended a *maximum* as the only cure for the spirit of extortion which, to the disgrace of the country, is daily encreasing in the article of corn, and spreading from that to almost all other articles of primary necessity, are accused by the author of this tract of being either *thoughtless* or *evil-minded*. Our readers cannot have forgotten that *we* are among the number; and we have found nothing in the book before us, after a very attentive perusal of it, to induce an alteration of our sentiments on the subject. We were fully aware that the example of France would, in this instance, be adduced as a warning to England, and therefore we were careful to anticipate the objection, and to shew that the Maximum proposed in this country bore no kind of analogy whatever to the Maximum adopted in France, either in its motive, its object, or its effect. We were fully acquainted with all the facts here stated by the author relative to the calamities produced in France by the Maximum. But we shewed that the grand object of that Maximum was not, in fact, to reduce the price of corn, but to reduce the value of, or, rather to give a forced currency to, the assignats. And it was this compulsion upon the farmer to take paper which he knew to be of *no value whatever* in exchange for his corn that urged him to destroy that corn rather than expose it to sale; and produced all the calamities which this

* Take the following instances. "Otherwise have impeded very troublesome obstacles," page 214.—"As follow."—"To consider it a staple commodity."—"Lands will succeed in any branch of culture," p. 5.—"Moreover than," p. 213.—"Luxuriant commodity."—"Sillage," p. 210.—"Wastage," p. 7.—"Antecedent crop," p. 9.—"Grubbing the Ground," p. 9.

author

author ſo ſtrongly and ſo juſtly deſcribes. Previous to the adoption of this meaſure, corn, if paid for in ſpecie, was comparatively cheap, but if paid for in aſſignats exorbitantly dear; and it is very well known to her to have been a common practice with tradeſmen, at that time, when a cuſtomer cheapened any article, to aſk whether he meant to pay for it in paper or in coin, and to fix the price accordingly. But how can any perſon of common ſenſe compare a maximum adopted under theſe circumſtances, with the maximum propoſed to be adopted in England, where paper is upon a par with ſpecie? And where would be the hardſhip impoſed on the farmer, if it were fixed, as it certainly would be, at ſuch a price, as would afford him a very high profit, and an ample compenſation for all his labour, expence, and riſk? To draw a compariſon between caſes, ſo radically different, is to triſle with the underſtanding of the public; and betrays much more *thoughtleſſneſs* than is to be diſcovered in the remarks of thoſe who do not accord in ſentiment with the author.

"The modern innovator"—ſhe ſays—"whoſe ſobereſt ſpeculations are not leſs raſh, than a madman's actions, may prove on paper, by line and rule, that a maximum will remedy a bad harveſt." It was ſurely beneath a lady, who is capable of better things, thus to raiſe up a phantom for the mere pleaſure of deſtroying it. She muſt have known that no innovator, either ſober or drunk, had ever advanced ſo prepoſterous a propoſition. We "need no ghoſt come from the grave" to tell us that a maximum will not convert a ſcarcity into plenty; but it will prevent avarice from aggravating the evils of ſcarcity, by extorting from the conſumer an exorbitant and unwarrantable price. Taking the deficiency of corn, at the rate ſpecified in the report of the Houſe of Commons, as equal to *two ſevenths* of an ordinary crop, which is certainly not *under-rated*, will this writer aſſign any reaſon why the encreaſed price ſhould be *double* the ordinary price? If ſhe cannot, will ſhe ſay that no meaſure ſhould be taken by the legiſlature to reſtrain this inordinate avarice? She ſeems totally to have forgotten that the farmer is a diſtinct being from every other ſpecies of trader, who have all an *abſolute* property on the articles in which they deal, while *he* can only have a *qualified* and *conditional* property in the fruits of the earth, which are neceſſary to the exiſtence of man, and were expreſsly given by the creator for his ſupport. If this were not the caſe, and he had a right, as the enemies of a maximum contend, to aſk any price he choſe for his corn, either to bring it to market or to withhold it, he would have a right to deſtroy it, and, conſequently, to ſtarve the public. This *deductio ad abſurdum*, as the logicians term it, is the beſt mode of proving the extreme weakneſs and folly of ſuch an argument. So clearly do we perceive the incalculable evils which will reſult to the country from the increaſed and increaſing price of proviſions, evils of a permanent and moſt extenſive nature, that we are fully impreſſed with the conviction, that, without the adoption of ſome ſpeedy means for checking it, the conſequences will be moſt ruinous. And we con-

ſeſs

ſeſs, in the preſent ſpirit and temper of the times, we can ſee no means that will be effectual but a *maximum*.

The ſpirit of *extortion* which pervades almoſt every deſcription of traders, at this moment, is moſt diſgraceful to the nation; and it appears never to have occurred to our author, that we have the authority of Scripture for pronouncing *extortion* to be a ſin, and *extortioners* to be ſinners in the eyes of the Lord. To repreſs the one and ſo to puniſh the others, then, ſeems to be a religious, as well as a political, duty.

It is not to be wondered at that, proceeding upon a falſe principle, all the author's arguments ſhould be not only defective but irrelevant. Two or three ſhort extracts will ſuffice to demonſtrate their *irrelevance*, and, at the ſame time, to prove the juſtice of our aſſertion reſpecting the diſſimilarity of the two caſes which are ſtated to be parallel. "*Diſtruſt of the aſſignats*, and ſcarcity of bread, have occaſioned a law to oblige the farmers to ſell their corn at a certain price, &c." (p. 5.) "Before the decree of the maximum if the lower claſſes of people in France could procure *money*, they often had bread" when others went without. (p. 7.) "In France, theſe monopolies were real—people thought any thing better than aſſignats; ſo they *purchaſed and hoarded* whatever came in their way—the whole country was playing at '*Jack's alive*' with the national paper, and every one got rid of it, as faſt as he could, to his neighbour, *for fear it ſhould expire* while he held it." (p. 8.) "The farmers, wherever they had the opportunity, concealed their grain, fed hogs and poultry with it, or ſold it privately." (p. 6.) In theſe few lines we have the *cauſe and conſequence* of the *French* maximum clearly defined; and a complete proof of the author's fundamental miſtake and unwarrantable inferences.

The panegyric on the farmers, towards the cloſe of the pamphlet, is moſt fulſome and unjuſt; and ſavours much more ſtrongly of prejudice than any clamour which has been excited againſt them. We have had as much experience of their diſpoſition and character, as the author can poſſibly have had, and probably more; and the reſult of our obſervation is, that, with many honourable exceptions, they are, *as a body*, the moſt diſcontented, growling, and rapacious ſet of men in his Majeſty's dominions. The obſervations which accompany this ſtrange panegyric are moſt reprehenſible; but the author's apprehenſions are groundleſs, for ſhe may reſt aſſured that, in the mind of an Engliſh farmer, malice will never prevail over intereſt; putting *religious* motives entirely out of the queſtion.

The tract is dedicated to Mr. Reeves to whom ſome well-deſerved compliments are paid; but it is rather too much to be told that his "name will be a pledge for the motives and veracity of the writer." Not that we mean to queſtion either the one or the other; but it ſurely would be not more unreaſonable than unuſual to expect that the perſon to whom a book is dedicated, is to be reſponſible for its contents.

Reflections

Reflections on the Juſtice, Advantage, and Neceſſity of limiting, within a certain Compaſs, the Price of Wheat, by Legiſlative Authority, addreſſed to both Houſes of Parliament. By the Author of Dearneſs of Proviſions, &c. 8vo. Pp. 32. 1s. Jones. Oxford. Stockdale. London. 1800.

THIS writer is decidedly of opinion, that the ſtock of wheat in the country ſhould be firſt aſcertained, and then its price, and if neceſſary, its conſumption limited, by law. The firſt of theſe objects has been attained, by the ſixth report of the committee of the Houſe of Commons, which fixes the annual conſumption of wheat at ſeven millions of quarters, and the laſt year's produce at five; what reliance is to be placed on the documents on which this calculation was founded, we ſhall not preſume to ſay; though it certainly appears to us, that both the conſumption and produce are under-rated. As to the limitation of the conſumption by law, it is a meaſure unqueſtionably deſireable, though its adoption would be attended with great difficulty. On the limitation of the *price*, we have already given our opinion; and every day's experience ſerves to ſtrengthen our conviction, that nothing ſhort of a *maximum* will ſuffice to check that diabolical ſpirit of avarice and extortion which gives to a limited deficiency one, at leaſt, of the worſt effects of an abſolute ſcarcity, and derives individual advantage from general diſtreſs. The author would have the maximum of wheat in London ten ſhillings (little more than one half of its preſent price!) and in the country nine ſhillings per buſhel. His ſuggeſtions are advanced with fairneſs and candour, and evidently prove him to be a man of ſenſe and benevolence.

Farther Thoughts on the preſent State of public Opinion; being a Continuation of a timely Appeal to the Common Senſe of the People of Great-Britain in general, and of the Inhabitants of Buckinghamſhire in particular, on the preſent Situation of Affairs. By J. Penn, Eſq. 8vo. Pp. 204. 5s. Hatchard. London. 1800.

THOUGH Mr. Penn's intentions are unqueſtionably very good in publiſhing this work, yet the work itſelf appears very defective both in plan and execution. We freely confeſs, indeed, that the plan is to us inexplicable: and the execution is open to a variety of objections. But the author is ſo truly reſpectable, his principles are ſo ſound, and his religious and moral character ſtand ſo deſervedly high in the world, that we ſhall not perform the ungrateful taſk of enumerating his literary defects.

Corn Trade. An Examination of certain Commercial Principles in their Application to Agriculture and the Corn Trade, as laid down in the Fourth Book of Mr. Adam Smith's Treatiſe on the Wealth of Nations; with Propoſals for Revival of the Statutes againſt Foreſtalling, &c. 8vo. Pp. 38. 1s. Stockdale. London. 1801.

THE object of this tract is to ſhew that the general principles laid down by Adam Smith in reſpect of the freedom of commerce can-

not have that unlimited application, which this theoretical writer pretended to give them; and, more eſpecially, that they are wholly inapplicable to the trade of corn, which, being an article of primary neceſſity, muſt be purchaſed, let the price be what it will.

"The diſtinctions of the article of *bread-corn*, in regard to and compariſon with every other article of trade, are obvious, under the two conſiderations of its being indiſpenſable for ſubſiſtence to the people generally, and in a commercial view, further, as a material on the price and value of which that of any (every) manufacture whatever muſt reſt, and the ſucceſsful trade thereof, in competition with other nations, muſt ultimately depend.

"From theſe conſiderations of higheſt import to the comfort and very life of our people, and ſecurity to the exigencies of (the) ſtate, may be juſtly and wiſely taken a diſtinction in the conduct of our market, for the article of bread-corn, by holding over it the arm of *regulation* and *controul*, in contradiſtinction to the general principles of free trade."

Our author fully eſtabliſhes his poſition, and overthrows the vain theory of the celebrated writer whom he attacks, as far as it affects the corn trade; but we think that he makes too great conceſſions to his adverſary, and that the *principle* of his reaſoning might be extended, in a certain degree, to other objects of commercial ſpeculation. To *paper* in particular, from woeful experience we know it might. That article in the courſe of eighteen months, has experienced a riſe of 33½ per cent, principally owing to a monopolizing combination of the moſt opulent ſtationers; one of whom has even boaſted, that by the additional riſe on paper (of five ſhillings a ream) in conſequence of the double duty juſt impoſed, he ſhall clear *forty thouſand pounds*, which could not be done without a ſtock in hand worth upwards of *two hundred and twenty thouſand pounds!* And yet we are to be inſulted with the miſerable nonſenſe, of comparing *monopoly* with *witchcraft*. If the Government do not ſpeedily interfere to check the abominable ſpirit of monopoly which is ſo generally prevalent, the ruin of the country will be the inevitable, and not very remote, conſequence.

Obſervations on the Publication of Walter Boyd, Eſq. M. P!!! By Sir Francis Baring, Bart. 8vo. Pp. 32. 1s. Sewell. London. 1801.

SIR Francis Baring is a very moderate, *liberal*, *candid*, and cautious aſſailant of Mr. Boyd. Indeed, the worthy Baronet appears to have ſo large a portion of philanthropy in his boſom, that the baſe idea of doing any thing ſo unpolite as contradicting another writer ſeems to ſhock him. "It is with great reluctance that I attempt to controvert the opinion of *any perſon*, and particularly that of Mr. Boyd." Yet, we muſt confeſs, that, for a writer of ſuch timidity and forbearance, he ſpeaks ſomewhat plainly. Ex. Gr. "I am inclined to think that, after conſidering the whole of the publication maturely,

maturely, and combining its various parts, Mr. Boyd is *himſelf* of opinion, that there is rather a want than a ſuperabundance of paper, to anſwer the purpoſe of a circulating medium." Now, moſt aſſuredly, if this were the caſe, if Mr. B. really thought one thing and ſaid another, he would be the moſt deteſtable hypocrite that ever ſought to miſlead and delude the public; becauſe if his ability had been adequate to enſure ſucceſs to his attempt, the miſchief he muſt have produced would have ſet all calculation at defiance. But, though we entertain no very high opinion of Mr. Boyd, we certainly cannot believe him capable of an act ſo atrocious as that which Sir Francis Baring here imputes to him.

Sir Francis further ſupports his charge by obſerving that if Mr. Boyd's notable plan for a new bank, in 1796, had been adopted, he (Mr. B.) would not have been ſatisfied with the additional circulation of paper to which he now attributes ſuch tremendous conſequences. "No; I remember well what paſſed at that time, and that he would have conſidered fifteen millions and a half of paper as very inadequate to furniſh a circulating medium for the country." Really, Sir Francis, you are too unpolite, theſe *recollections* are intolerable!

Sir Francis treats with ſovereign contempt the prepoſterous idea that the encreaſed emiſſion of bank notes ſhould have produced the *contrary effects* of raiſing the price of proviſions and of ſtock! And he, indeed, denies, and ſupports his denial with arguments and facts, that it could produce any of the conſequences which Mr. Boyd has imputed to it. The fall of foreign exchanges, Sir F. concludes, can only operate upon the exported produce and manufacture of the country and not on the internal conſumption. His reaſoning on this point appears to be equally pertinent and concluſive.

"Let us try it by a caſe in point, and a caſe which applies to the whole of the queſtion—I mean the price of wheat, and let us ſuppoſe that it ſells in the market for 150s. and that the Exchange is 10 per cent. againſt us; from the price of 150s. deduct the difference of exchange 15s. If the exchange were equal to bullion, it would be 135s. So far Mr. Boyd is right with regard to wheat imported from abroad; but it remains for him to prove that, if the exchange on Hamburgh was 33s. inſtead of 30s. the Farmers in Eſſex, Kent, &c. would ſell their wheat for 135s. inſtead of 150s. and what is more, he ought to prove that when the exchange on Hamburgh is at 33s. the Eſſex farmer would get as much by the price of 135s. as he would by the price of 150s. when the Hamburgh Exchange is at 30s. If he cannot prove this, he muſt admit that the foreign Exchanges have no influence or effect upon the price of corn grown in this country.

"Perhaps Mr. Boyd is not aware in what manner his own quotations and his own arguments may return againſt him by the delay of a few days. In the introduction, dated the 31ſt of December, 1800, he obſerves that, ſince his letter was written, the Exchange in Hamburgh had fallen from 31s. 10d. to 29s. 10d. which he conſiders as an additional proof of what he has advanced. In that caſe he muſt admit

admit that when the exchange riſes, it muſt produce a comparatively favourable effect. On the 2d of January, 1801, the courſe on Hamburgh is printed 29s. 8d. a difference of very near 7 per cent. and yet we do not perceive the ſlighteſt effect it has produced in lowering the price of proviſions, or other commodities grown and conſumed in Great Britain, and affords a moſt unequivocal correct anſwer to the whole of his argument with regard to the foreign Exchanges."

Mr. Boyd has, for ſeveral days paſt, cauſed a new edition of his pamphlet to be advertiſed in the papers; with *additions* profeſſing to contain an anſwer to all the objections which have been urged againſt it. We have waited till the laſt moment, in the hope of being able to give ſome account of this new edition in our preſent Number; but, whether or no it has been purpoſely delayed, in order to reſcue it from animadverſion for one month at leaſt, we know not; but it has not yet appeared. We therefore ſhall poſtpone our reply to ſome comments in an inſolent letter, which was inſerted in a Morning Paper, on our review of Mr. Boyd's pamphlet, which we ſtand pledged to notice, until we have an opportunity of conſidering that letter, and the new pamphlet—links of the ſame chain—together.

A Letter to a Nobleman on the propoſed Repeal of the Penal Laws which now remain in force againſt the Iriſh Roman Catholics. From Charles Butler, Eſq. of Lincoln's Inn. 8vo. Pp. 16. Coghlan. 1801.

MR. BUTLER being a rigid Catholic himſelf pleads, of courſe, the cauſe of Catholic emancipation, with equal zeal and feeling. But he certainly has not exerciſed his uſual judgement in the dogmatical manner in which he here talks—for he does not condeſcend to *reaſon*—of the Coronation Oath, the only point in his ſhort pamphlet worthy of notice. He roundly aſſerts that the repeal of the Penal Statutes now in force againſt the Iriſh Catholics, by which they would be eligible to ſeats in both Houſes of Parliament, and to all places of truſt and power, "does not, in any reſpect, interfere with the coronation oath." But, notwithſtanding the confidence with which this dictum is advanced, and which, after what has recently paſſed, cannot be deemed very decorous, it is wholly unſupported by reaſon or fact.

"His Majeſty," ſays Mr. B. "ſwears to maintain '*the proteſtant reformed religion eſtabliſhed by law*:" this could only mean the proteſtant reformed religion, as, from time to time, under the legiſlation of Parliament, it ſhould be the church eſtabliſhment of the country. As to the conſtitutional interpretation of the clauſe,—it would be abſurd in the extreme, unconſtitutional, and perhaps even treaſonable, to contend that the expreſſion in queſtion precludes his Majeſty from concurring with both Houſes of Parliament in any legiſlative act whatſoever. Even if it did preclude him from ſuch a concurrence,

it

it would be no objection to his repealing the laws in queſtion, as the repeal of them will not interfere with the legal eſtabliſhment of the Church, with any part of the hierarchy, or with any of its temporal or ſpiritual rights and privileges. After all, it may be enquired what ſyſtem of caſuiſtry made it lawful for his Majeſty to aſſent to the repeal of the large proportion of penal laws, repealed by the acts of 1778, 1782, and 1793, and now makes it unlawful for him to aſſent to the repeal of the ſmall proportion of thoſe laws yet remaining unrepealed; or that made it lawful for him to ſanction a partial repeal of the Teſt Act in 1782, and makes it unlawful for him to ſanction a total repeal of it in 1801. But all this diſcuſſion is ſuperfluous. The coronation oath was fixed in Ireland by the firſt of William and Mary; at that time Roman Catholic peers had their ſeats, and voted in the Houſe of Lords, Roman Catholic commoners were eligible to the Houſe of Commons, and all civil and military offices were open to Roman Catholics; they were deprived of theſe rights by the acts of the third and fourth of William and Mary, and the firſt and ſecond of Queen Anne. Now the coronation oath can only refer to the ſyſtem of law which was in force when the act, which preſcribed it, was paſſed; but the Iriſh laws, meant to be repealed, are ſubſequent to that act; to thoſe laws, therefore, or to any ſimilar laws, the coronation oath cannot be referred."

Here, again, Mr. B. is ſtrong in aſſertion but weak in argument. No one denies the *power* of his Majeſty to concur in any act of Parliament whatever; but how far he could concur in an act which wold admit Popiſh Peers into a Proteſtant Parliament, without a violation of his coronation oath, is another queſtion. Mr. B. indeed, tells us, in a very dictatorial manner, that ſuch a meaſure "would not interfere with the legal eſtabliſhment of the Church." His Majeſty, however, it ſeems, thinks otherwiſe; and we heartily concur in opinion with him. Nobody appears to doubt, that, if the Catholic peers were ever to acquire an aſcendancy in the Houſe, our Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, at leaſt, would be immediately deſtroyed;—thinking, as they do, they would not be true to themſelves, if they did not labour to deſtroy it; and it ſurely would be little ſhort of an act of political madneſs to admit men into Parliament whoſe aſcendancy would, avowedly, be attended with ſuch fatal conſequences. The inquiry which Mr. B. makes relative "to the repeal of the large proportion of penal laws," had been made before by a writer in one of the newſpapers. But can a man of his underſtanding really put ſuch a queſtion ſeriouſly? Any ſchoolboy would ſupply the following anſwer to it—His Majeſty conſented to the repeal of thoſe ſtatutes becauſe he wiſhed to extend every practicable indulgence to his Romiſh ſubjects, and becauſe he thought they might be repealed without endangering the Eſtabliſhed Religion of his kingdom, and, *therefore*, conſiſtently with his coronation oath;—and he now refuſes to repeal the "*ſmall proportion* of thoſe laws yet remaining unrepealed," becauſe he feels, in common with the majority of his proteſtant ſubjects, that they cannot be repealed without endangering the Church Eſtabliſhment, and, conſequently, not without

a violation of his coronation oath. Is there any *caſuiſtry*, any inconſiſtency in this? Oh! but—exclaims Mr. Butler, moſt triumphantly—"all this diſcuſſion is ſuperfluous." Well, then, to pleaſe him, we will wave all farther diſcuſſion on this head, for the preſent, though we ſhall certainly enter much at large into it hereafter, and attend to his deciſive argument, that renders all other arguments nugatory and vain. "The coronation oath can *only* refer to the ſyſtem of law which was in force when the act which preſcribed it was paſſed." Indeed! and is it true, then, that when his Majeſty ſwears to maintain *the proteſtant reformed religion as eſtabliſhed by law*, he is not to maintain it ſuch as it was at the time when he took the oath, but ſuch as it was ſixty or ſeventy years before? By parity of reaſoning, and with equal juſtice, we may be next told, that his Majeſty bearing the title of *Defender of the Faith* is not bound to defend the faith ſuch as it was when he came to the throne, but ſuch as it was at the time when the title was firſt given; and, of courſe, that he is bound to defend the Popiſh faith, becauſe the title was conferred on Henry the Eighth by the Pope? Miſerable ſophiſtry! unworthy a man of Mr. Butler's ſenſe and talents. Is not Mr. B. aware that he has, in this very paſſage, ſupplied us with a very ſtrong argument againſt himſelf? After the revolution the Iriſh Catholics were allowed to enjoy all the moſt important of the privileges which they now claim; but they were only ſuffered to enjoy them for a very ſhort time: the Legiſlature deemed it neceſſary to deprive them of thoſe *rights*. Is it not, then, fair to infer, from this hiſtorical fact, that their admiſſion to ſeats in Parliament, and to places of truſt and power in the State, was proved, by the beſt of all teſts, that of *experience*, to be incompatible with the ſafety of the Conſtitution in Church and State? Never, ſurely, was an argument ſo triumphantly urged, ſo weak and inconcluſive!

We much fear that the Romaniſts will, by miſtaken zeal, deprive thoſe who have the moſt friendly diſpoſition towards them, (and we profeſs ourſelves to be of the number) of the means of defending them againſt their moſt inveterate enemies. And, certain we are, they will injure the cauſe which they wiſh to promote. We could urge many more ſtrong arguments againſt Mr. Butler's poſitions, but we have ſaid ſufficient to ſhew their fallacy. We entertain a high reſpect for the author, but none for his letter. We would much rather ſee an enlargement of his *Horæ Biblicæ*, than an extenſion of his correſpondence with a nobleman.

DIVINITY.

A Sermon preached at Chriſt Church, Newgate Street, before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, the Aldermen, and Governors of the Royal Hoſpitals of the City of London, on St. Matthew's Day, Friday, the 21ſt of September, 1798. By the Rev. Arthur William Trollope, M. A. Vicar of Ugley, Eſſex. 4to. Pp. 24. London.

THE

THE occaſion, on which this excellent diſcourſe was preached, was the annual commemoration of the founders and benefactors of the city hoſpitals. It was printed, as appears from the dedication prefixed, by the deſire of the governors of Chriſt's Hoſpital; but, as we imagine, not publiſhed; no bookſeller's name being in the title-page. A copy falling into our hands, the ſentiments according with our own, and it appearing to us calculated to render much ſervice to the cauſe of religion and virtue, we could not refrain from giving it a place in our Review; not without a hope, that it might induce Mr. T. to afford our readers the like pleaſure which the peruſal of it has afforded us. The reſpectable audience, before whom it was delivered, have borne their decided teſtimony to its merits, by their requeſt that it might be printed: but a topic, ſo peculiarly needful to be inſiſted on, in theſe times of infidelity and ſcepticiſm, as that which is ſelected for the ſubject of this diſcourſe, (viz; the grounds of a Chriſtian's belief in the goſpel and ſo ably treated,) well deſerves to be circulated beyond the limits of the royal hoſpitals.

The Rev. Preacher (from 1 Peter iii. 15.) ſhews the ſuperior excellence and purity of the morality of the Chriſtian religion above that of all other ſyſtems of ethics; the firm foundation on which the Chriſtian's belief of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments is built; the influence of that belief on his moral conduct; and the arts that are employed by the deiſtical philoſopher, to bereave him of every conſolation and ſupport, under the ſorrows and cares of human life. Having pointed out, in a brief, but ſatisfactory, manner, the external evidences of Chriſtianity, and defined the province and limits of reaſon in matters of religion, Mr. T. proceeds to obſerve (P. 18.) that the ſource of that infidelity, which rejects "a faith ſo rational and full of comfort, for the ſake of a deluſive philoſophy, which offers to man nothing, that is capable either of ſatisfying the hopes, or calming the fears of the ſoul, is to be traced, in a great meaſure, to the method that is at preſent almoſt generally obſerved in the education of youth." "Inſtead of inſtilling into the tender mind early ideas of devotion and religion, and leading it from the firſt dawning of reaſon to a knowledge of the truths of the goſpel, and of the evidence upon which they are eſtabliſhed; the whole attention of the young ſtudent is directed to the acquirement of what are called polite accompliſhments; and the doctrines of that church, of which he was made a member at his baptiſm, form, at beſt, but a ſecondary part of his inſtructions, and are often times left merely to chance, or, perhaps, entirely omitted. We muſt not imagine, that this is an evil confined to the higher ſpheres of life; to the families of the noble and opulent: it has diffuſed itſelf throughout the middle orders of ſociety: the ſubtile poiſon has even ſpread its infection among thoſe claſſes, where, independent of [on] more weighty conſiderations, the practice cannot be juſtified upon the motives of common worldly prudence and economy. By theſe means the mind, from its earlieſt days, acquires an habitual indifference to ſerious and devout enquiry;

its religion (if it can be ſaid to poſſeſs any religion) is *like a houſe built upon the ſand*, which the firſt breath of ſtrange doctrine overturns; and infidelity is the ſtructure erected upon the ruins."

Zealous as we feel, for the honour of our holy religion, the proſperity of the country, and the welfare of individuals, we would willingly cheriſh the pleaſing hope, that the complaints, which have been ſo recently made, of the *total* neglect of religious inſtruction in ſome of our public ſchools, are not well-founded; at leaſt, not to the extent in which they have been ſaid to exiſt. But we muſt not treat the declarations of ſuch men, as the *venerable veteran of Nayland*, a *Randolph*, or a *Rennel*, as the peeviſh cenſures of the fanatic or enthuſiaſt: and, if there be *any real* cauſe for complaint; if inattention only, in a matter of ſuch momentous concern, as that of inſtilling ſound principles of religion into the yet uncontaminated mind, hath crept into ſchools with the relaxed diſcipline of the times;

——————— ah
Tantamne rem tam negligenter agere!

loudly and imperiouſly are the teacher and the parent, and all, without diſtinction, on whom devolves the charge of the riſing generation, called upon, to refute, or remove, an imputation, ſo diſgraceful to a Chriſtian country, and ruinous both to individuals and ſociety. Of thoſe academies, boarding ſchools, and other like ſeminaries of *liberal* education, that ſpring up without number, or *licence*, in every town and ſtreet, almoſt, throughout the kingdom, we, at preſent, make no obſervation. But, wiſhing, as we moſt ſincerely do, the untarniſhed honour, and unceaſing proſperity, of thoſe antient and truly venerable foundations for the education of youth, the *public and free ſchools*; thoſe noble monuments of royal munificence, that have, through ſo many ſucceſſive generations, preſerved and tranſmitted to us the invaluable bleſſings of learning and religion; in which have been formed the moſt illuſtrious characters in every rank and profeſſion; we cannot but moſt earneſtly hope that, at leaſt, in *theſe* "*true religion and uſeful learning may for ever flouriſh and abound.*" It lies, in a great meaſure, with the parent, and directors of theſe national ſeminaries, to ſilence the tongue of calumny, that would fix on the Univerſities the unmerited blame and diſgrace, that attach only to the unworthy individual, who diſhonours the place of his education by groſs miſconduct. Such miſconduct, whenever known, is no longer ſuffered to paſs uncenſured: nor does it frequently originate in thoſe ſeats of piety and learning; it oftener proceeds from vicious habits, previouſly nouriſhed and formed, in the family or the ſchool. In *one* univerſity, we can aſſert, from a long reſidence within its peaceful and ſtudious retreats, that none of our aſſociates, the companions and friends of our early years, ſo diſgraced themſelves: and we may add, without fear of contradiction, that no young man, who becomes a member of either univerſity, with his principles formed, and his morals uncorrupted, will be in danger of contamination, unleſs through his own neglect.

But

But whatever ſhare of blame may belong to any of our public ſchools, we are happy to agree with Mr. T. that, in this reſpect, none, without the moſt palpable injuſtice, can be fixed on the royal and antient foundation of *Chriſt's Hoſpital*; "where," (to uſe the energetic language of the preacher) P. 21. "piety and learning are united; where religion is made the ground-work of all other knowledge, and the firſt object is to lead the youthful mind to an acquaintance with the doctrines of our holy faith, and *the reaſons of the hope that is in us.*"

Since this diſcourſe was preached, Mr. Trollope (as we are informed) has been called to fill the upper grammar maſter's chair: a ſituation of equal reſpectability and reſponſibility; which was occupied, during a long ſeries of years, by his worthy predeceſſor; who retired from that arduous and honorable ſtation, remunerated for his long, faithful, and meritorious ſervices, by the diſtinguiſhed literary honours, obtained by his ſcholars in both univerſities, and the ſubſtantial tribute of reſpect ſince paid him, by the governors of the hoſpital.

From the principles and talents of his pupil and ſucceſſor, we are led to ſay *non deficit alter aureus*; and we cannot expreſs our good-will towards that ſchool of piety, learning, and good manners, more effectually, than by our ſincere wiſh that it may long continue to poſſeſs ſuch valuable ſervices! We ſhall cloſe our remarks, with the following pathetic *apoſtrophe*, which forms the peroration of Mr. Trollope's diſcourſe. (P. 23.) "Happy, happy family! if the ſeeds of virtue, now ſown in your breaſts, ſtrike root, and bring forth their fruit in due ſeaſon; if the hope, in which ye are now taught to truſt, be ſo written in the tablet of your hearts, as never to be effaced! So ſhall ye beſt repay that parental care, which ſhields your tender years from the dangerous examples of a wicked world; ſo ſhall ye at length arrive at the completion of that hope in the enjoyment of thoſe heavenly bleſſings, which *eye hath not ſeen nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man to conceive.*"

A Letter reſpectfully addreſſed to the Right Reverend Father in God, Henry Reginald, by Divine Permiſſion, Lord Biſhop of Exeter; containing a Vindication of Truth, an Expoſure of Detraction, and an earneſt Appeal to his Lordſhip, as a conſtituted Guardian of the Church, for the Preſervation of her Peace, Dignity, and Proſperity. By one of her humble, but moſt affectionate Friends. 8vo. Pr. 2*s*. Cadell. London. 1800.

"WHEN truth or virtue an affront endures,
The affront is mine, my lord, and ſhould be your's.
Mine, as a friend to every worthy mind;
And mine, as man, who feel for all mankind."

"I am aware (ſays the letter-writer) that it may be aſked, what buſineſs I have to trouble your Lordſhip with my opinions: I can only anſwer, juſt as much as Mr. Polwhele had, to favour you with his." Perhaps ſo. But the contrary is rather to be preſumed, till the

writer ſhall think proper to diſcover himſelf. To approach the Biſhop in maſquerade appears to us an act of diſreſpect. The author boldly aſſerts ſeveral things, but attempts to prove nothing. His ſole intention, indeed, in addreſſing his Lordſhip of Exeter, is to requeſt, it ſeems, the Dioceſan's interference in the conteſt between Mr. Polwhele and Dr. Hawker. This he repeats at Pp. 5 and 6: and yet, at p. 15, "I rejoice to learn (ſays he) from Mr. Polwhele himſelf, that his Letter to your lordſhip is to cloſe his labours in this controverſy!!!"

The writer intimates, that "itinerancy and nonconformity, properly ſo called, meet his firm diſapprobation, howſoever or by whomſoever committed." What, then, can be more clearly proved than Dr. Hawker's itinerancy and nonconformity, in Mr. P.'s Letter to the Biſhop of Exeter? In his itinerancy, taking the word in its moſt extenſive ſenſe, Dr. Hawker glories: he avows his approbation of itinerant preachers, and his own diſpoſition to itinerate, with the view of preaching the Goſpel, in the moſt deciſive terms. And, in regard to the other charge, Mr. P. and Mr. Wotton of Plymouth, have adduced a great variety of particulars; the third part of which would be ſufficient to prove Dr. H. a nonconformiſt, to every unprejudiced mind. Had not pages, indeed, aſſerting the contrary, been ſpread before us, at this moment, we ſhould not have believed it poſſible, that the miſts of prejudice could have obſcured truths ſo ſelf-evident; ſo palpable! Having quitted Mr. Polwhele, this author proceeds to inſtruct the Biſhop in the doctrine of evangelical righteouſneſs. His Lordſhip had obſerved, in his admirable Charge, "There ariſes in the minds of ſome men *a notion of I know not what evangelical righteouſneſs*, &c. &c. On which the letter-writer, with intolerable pertneſs and flippancy, remarks: "As your lordſhip ſo candidly confeſſes, that you know not what this evangelical righteouſneſs is, the *notion* of which you ſo peremptorily condemn," &c. &c. "*We* underſtand no other than that which God declared for the remiſſion of ſins." "Such, my lord, is that evangelical righteouſneſs, of which a *notion* has been, and will, I truſt, long continue to be entertained. If thoſe who have imbibed this *notion* appear ſtill to you to be miſled, you will, at leaſt, allow, that they are the dupes of no ordinary deceivers." Enough of ſuch language.

A Sermon on Cruelty to Dumb Animals, preached at the Free Church, now called Chriſt's Church in Bath, on the Sunday before Laſt, 1799. By the Rev. Charles Daubeny, Miniſter of Chriſt's Church, Bath; Author of "*the Guide to the Church.*" 12mo. Pp. 16. 3d. or 1l. 1s. per 100. Hazard, Bath; Vernor and Hood. London.

"IT ſhould be remembered," ſays this pious and able Divine, that whatever hardens the heart, tends to render it leſs ſuſceptible of the impreſſions of Chriſtianity. For although tender feelings and Chriſtianity are not inſeparably connected; yet, it may be ſaid, that,

that, where tender feelings are wanting, genuine Chriſtianity will never be found. The parent who conſiders this, and conſiders, moreover, that cruelty to dumb animals, in ſpite of all thoſe high pretenſions to civilization which we boaſt, is, it is to be feared, one of the crying ſins of this nation; will be anxious to counteract a growing evil, at the only period of life, at which, perhaps, it is to be counteracted with effect." The parent who is not anxious ſo to do, is certainly neglectful of his duty; cruelty to dumb animals betrays an unfeeling heart and a depraved mind; and ſhould never paſs without puniſhment. When the Creator ſubjected the beaſts of the field to the uſe of man, he never intended to render them the objects of man's cruelty.—This ſermon ſhould be widely circulated.

On the Difference between the Deaths of the Righteous and the Wicked, illuſtrated in the Inſtance of Dr. Samuel Johnſon and David Hume, Eſq. A Sermon preached before the Univerſity of Oxford, at St. Mary's Church, on Sunday July 23, 1786. By the Rev. William Agutter, A. M. of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford, and Chaplain to the Aſylum. 12mo. Pp. 20. No Bookſeller's Name. 1800.

SCEPTICS, Infidels, and Deiſts, having triumphed in the calmneſs diſplayed by HUME, and the fears betrayed by JOHNSON, on their death-beds, Mr. Agutter takes occaſion to ſhew, by an able and judicious train of reaſoning, that no argument was to be drawn from that circumſtance, favourable to the enemies of the Chriſtian faith.

"Conſidering the common depravity of our nature, and the awful ſcene of probation cloſed, our adverſaries ought to allow that the Chriſtian trembling, and the Deiſt laughing, at the awful ſeparation of ſoul and body, may be illuſtrated by the caſe of two criminals, who are going to make ſatisfaction to the laws which they have violated; the one, from an habitual courſe of guilt, has attained that total want of reflection which induces him to deride the deciſion of juſtice, and to undergo his ſentence with that ſtupid indifference, which ſuperficial obſervers may miſtake for fortitude, while the other, a novice in the practice of ſin, is overwhelmed with ingenuous ſhame, views his violations of the law in the moſt glaring light, and approaches with undiſſembled dread to the preſence of his God and his Judge. The firſt of theſe characters may be applauded by thoſe who are equally hardened in guilt, or equally blinded by infidelity; but we cannot be ſuch ſtrangers to the nature of man, as, from the language of confident boaſting, to argue for the rectitude of his judgment, or the integrity of his cauſe."

We believe this to be a pretty fair ſtatement of the caſe, as it effects the two objects of compariſon. To ſuch men as Dr. Anderſon, whoſe ſcandalous abuſe of Dr. Johnſon, (a man as ſuperior to him, in all reſpects, as an eagle is to a mole) betrays an equal want of feeling and of judgment, we recommend the preacher's juſt admonition towards the cloſe of his Sermon, where he recommends leſs attention to the death of others and ſome preparation for our own. This diſcourſe is alike creditable to the Preacher's talents and his principles.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Polwhele's Grecian Proſpects.—Report of the Clergy of a Diſtrict in the Dioceſe of Lincoln.—Speech of Thomas Jones, Eſq.

IN our animadverſions on the Critical Review, we have, once or twice, aſſerted, and had occaſion to produce proofs of the aſſertion, that, whilſt the praiſe of the Engliſh and the cenſure of the French are moſt obnoxious to its diſaffected authors, the gentleman, who hath any way diſtinguiſhed himſelf for his attachment to his king and country, can expect from them no quarter, in whatever ſhape he comes forward; whether as a proſe-writer, he follow the track of Goldſmith or of Pennant, or as a poet, he chaunt claſſic numbers in the manner of Pope or of Spenſer. Of this aſſertion, a freſh proof is now furniſhed by the critique on Polwhele's "GRECIAN PROSPECTS." It is with indignation, that the Sans-culotte critic before us hath noticed the tale which Mr. P. had "detached from the poem as defective in the unities." If "UNFOUNDED SLANDER OF THE FRENCH" (cries this Robeſpierre of a reviewer) and UNFOUNDED PRAISE OF THE ENGLISH be repugnant to truth and juſtice, ſomething more ſolid than the poetic unities is offended by this feeble fiction!!!"* The man's ideas of "truth and juſtice" are evidently drawn from the Godwinian Philoſophy. That ſuch an avowed enemy of his country ſhould be permitted to remain unmaſked is a circumſtance which we cannot but lament. After quoting eight ſtanzas, to which he makes no exception, the hypercritic obſerves, that "the ſtanza of Spenſer is peculiarly unfit for Mr. Polwhele's poetry." Surely, if he would wiſh to be conſiſtent with himſelf, he ought to recollect his report of Mr. Polwhele's happy management of the ſtanza of Spenſer, in "*the Influence of Local Attachment.*" "We heſitate not to pronounce (ſays he) that the poem is executed in ſuch a manner, as to do credit to the author, and give pleaſure to his readers. The verſe is always elegant; often brilliant; a great deal of pleaſing deſcriptive poetry is happily introduced in the various illuſtrations which preſent themſelves; the ſtanza is well managed, and free from that monotony, which, in feeble hands, it is apt to ſink into," &c. &c. &c.† What ſays the Critical Reviewer to all this? Truly "the Local Attachment" was publiſhed without a name: and we doubt not but the critic was greatly chagrined at the diſcovery, that the poem was Mr. Polwhele's.

The notice of "the Report from the Clergy of a diſtrict in the Dioceſe of Lincoln," &c. is glaringly jacobinical. "The Report comes out (ſays the pretended critic) under very ſuſpicious circumſtances." "If ſuch a meeting was ever holden, the name of the diſtrict is not communicated to the public. We can ſcarcely believe

* See Crit. Rev. for Aug. 1800. P. 448.

† Crit. Rev. for September 1796, PP. 19, 20.

that

that ſuch a meeting ever took place." "The heads of the church, will be careful that examples of irregularity do not proceed from their own body." "The powers of the church are, at preſent, ſufficiently ample: and the ſpiritual exertions of the clergy will prevent any inroads on the eſtabliſhment from ignorant and illiterate preachers: at the ſame time, it will be difficult for the legiſlature to interfere in the diſcipline of a meeting-houſe, without infringing that toleration which it has ever been the pride and honour of the Hanoverian family to maintain."‡ We have, elſewhere, obſerved, that Methodiſts and Jacobins have one common intereſt.

On "the Speech of Thomas Jones, Eſq. M. P." the reviewer is pleaſed in expatiating. "Mr. Jones thinks, that the miniſters are fighting merely for the ſake of the Bourbon family; and, if they are not, he deſires to know, for what object on earth the people of England are groaning under an unprecedented and inquiſitorial ſyſtem of taxation."*

Bardomachia, Poema Macaronico-Latinum. 4to. 1s. Johnſon. London. 1800.

Bardomachia; or the Battle of the Bards. Tranſlated from the Original Latin. 4to. 1s. Johnſon. London. 1800.

OUR readers need ſcarcely be told, that theſe productions relate to the ruffian attack made by the wretch who calls himſelf Peter Pindar on the reſpectable author of the Baviad and Mæviad. They have at leaſt one characteriſtic of poetry, *fiction*, for not the ſmalleſt regard to truth is obſerved in any part of the account here given of the tranſaction, in as miſerable doggrel, both Latin and Engliſh, as the ſtupidity of modern times has produced. The evident object of the author, Dr. GEDDES, (who does not prefix his name to the book but who cauſes it to be proclaimed in every bookſeller's ſhop,) is to place on a par two men who are as unlike each other as genius and dullneſs, virtue and vice. The deſign is worthy the daring and frantic arraigner of the inſpiration of the holy writers, of the divinity of the Holy Scriptures; of a man, who, to uſe the words of an energetic writer, "ſweeps away, in the very tone of idiot effrontery, the divine authority of both the codes of Scripture, and involves the New Teſtament with the Old in his comprehenſive range of reprobation."

Yet is this wretched effuſion of claſſical dotage hailed, by the Monthly and Critical Reviewers, as the genuine production of genius; and they have even the folly to quote paſſages, which give the lie to their praiſes. By the latter of theſe congenial critics, the Bardomachia is proclaimed to have "by far the advantage of all the productions to which this fertile theme has given birth," and the

---

‡ See C. Review for Aug. 1800, p. 477.
* See C. Rev. for Aug. 1800, p. 454.

author

author is, forſooth! "a learned and *facetious* divine who has formerly amuſed us with ſimilar effuſions." The former, well knowing his man, would not "be ſo very faſtidious as to require a rigid attention to dull matter of fact;" a pretty apology for lying truly! The lax morality of this critic is wonderfully in uniſon with the feelings and the principles of his favourite author. But it is too much to be told that "his Latinity evinces an intimate acquaintance with the claſſics;" and that "his Engliſh manifeſts equal talents and playfulneſs." Not that we mean to impeach the claſſical knowledge of Dr. Geddes; but moſt certainly the lines before us diſplay no proof of that or any other ſpecies of knowledge, except, indeed, a knowledge of the art of falſification, in which the doctor is known to be an adept, although it has pleaſed Dr. Griffiths's ſage reviewer to *mis*-repreſent him as "*celebrated* for works in the higheſt department of biblical criticiſm."

We ſhall conclude our remarks on theſe miſerable productions with an epigram which has been put into our hands by an intelligent and eſtimable friend.

On Dr. Geddes's Bardomachia.

"The fool hath ſaid in his heart, there is no God."

So ran the Royal Pſalmiſt's ſacred lines;
And Geddes vindicates the eternal rule.
He ſcoffs his Maker—there the *Atheiſt* ſhines;
He praiſes Peter Pindar—there the *fool!*

The celebrated Speech of the Hon. C. J. Fox, with the Proceedings of the Meeting at the Shakeſpeare Tavern, on Friday, October 10, 1800, *being the Anniverſary of his firſt Election for Weſtminſter. Wherein he ſhews the improper Conduct of Miniſters, in continuing an unjuſt War, that has ſpilt our Blood, ſquandered our Treaſure, contracted a Load of National Debt we are unable to bear, and reduced the People to their preſent deplorable Situation!!! Fourth Edition. To which are added, Two much admired Songs, ſung at the above Meeting by a well-known Whig.* Jordan. London.

WE know no one of the whole fraternity of the lower claſs of *Whigs*, ſo ſkilful in the compoſition of a title-page to a ſeditious pamphlet, as the miſerable being who proclaims himſelf the publiſher of this wretched farrago of inflammatory and libellous declamation, collected from the Jacobin prints of the day. As the publiſher of Paine's Rights of Man, the *fundamental doctrine* of which Mr. Fox here maintains, this man, who acted as the tool of another, eſcaped punithment; he has ſince ſuffered impriſonment for publiſhing ſome other libel; but neither the imp nity which he experienced in the firſt inſtance, nor the correction which he received in the laſt, has made any impreſſion on his mind, or produced any alteration in his conduct; he ſtill perſeveres in collecting

ſecting all the filth of the Jacobinical ſewers, and adminiſtering it, in various forms, to his *patriotic* cuſtomers.

Since Mr. Fox has thought proper to quit the ſenate for the tavern, and to continue his occaſional harangues at the convivial board, he has had leſs occaſion for the impoſition of reſtraints on his fertile imagination, or for the limitation of his tongue to the repetition of what the Monthly reviewers would call *dull matters of fact*. Where a man incurs no danger of contradiction, unleſs he be under the influence of integrity, he has neither motive nor temptation to adhere to the truth. If this be a correct report of Mr. Fox's ſpeech, the *licentia mentiendi* was never exerciſed to a greater extent, as our readers will acknowledge, when they ſhall have read ſome of the aſſertions which we ſhall extract from the pamphlet before us.

After an appropriate eulogy upon *himſelf*, (after the manner of Mr. Erſkine, who was preſent, and applauded him,) in which he obſerved, that he was "an honeſt man," (an obſervation which, of courſe, he deemed *neceſſary*,) and had followed "a ſyſtem, juſt, liberal, and comprehenſive," he told his friends that he could not have ſecured "the approbation of his country," (a Whig's *country*, it ſeems, is his *club*) "unleſs he had formed his conduct upon general principles applicable to all times." Certainly no one, who has the leaſt acquaintance with the public life of Mr. Fox can deny, that his principles are applicable, not only to all times, but to all queſtions, and to both ſides of every queſtion; for there is ſcarcely any one grand political queſtion which has been brought into diſcuſſion within the laſt five and twenty years, in which Mr. Fox has not decidedly committed himſelf *on both ſides*; as for inſtance, the queſtion of Parliamentary repreſentation, on which he has at one time maintained, that the ſenſe of the nation could only be aſcertained by the voice of Parliament, and at another, that it could only be collected out of Parliament; at one time, that the Members of the Houſe of Commons were bound to obey the mandates of their immediate conſtituents; and, at another, that being repreſentatives of the aggregate body of the people, they were not bound to obey the inſtructions of particular electors, but to conſult the real intereſts of the community at large. Such principles may be truly ſaid to be *comprehenſive*, in the moſt extenſive ſignification of the term.

Mr. Fox talks of "rights which are the birth-right of man, antecedent to the eſtabliſhment of any particular form of government." Theſe can be no other than the rights of Adam, either before or after his fall, when he exerciſed abſolute authority over all the inhabitants of the earth; rights, of courſe, which cannot be enjoyed by any man who has the misfortune to be born after the "eſtabliſhment of any particular form of government." But theſe are mere *verba et voces*; for Mr. Fox evidently alluded to man's *political* rights, becauſe he immediately afterwards refers to the aſſertion of ſuch rights by the Americans in the laſt war. This, however, is declamatory rant, merely calculated for the purpoſe of deception,

for

for Mr. F. muſt know, that no man can have any political rights but ſuch as reſult from political eſtabliſhments; in other words, ſuch as are ſecured to him by the laws of his country, which conſtitute at once the ſource and the ſecurity of all political rights. But this interpretation will not bear Mr. Fox out in his argument, which, taken in its only obvious ſenſe, affirms the right in queſtion to be the right of oppoſing the laws, the *right of rebellion*; yet how ſuch right could exiſt "antecedent to any particular form of government," it is not very eaſy to conceive, ſince, without a government of ſome ſort or other, there would be neither motive to rebel, nor object of rebellion. No matter; Whig orators are not to be ſtopped by the obſtacles which common ſenſe or common honeſty interpoſes to the wiſhes or deſigns of common men; and this rhodomontade ſerved, as well as any thing elſe, as a preface to the declaration that he, Mr. Fox, "did not heſitate to declare in Parliament *in favour of America*, and his wiſhes for the ſucceſs of thoſe men who were then *ſtigmatized as rebels!*" Who were not *ſtigmatized*, Mr. Fox, but who were declared by our *Sovereign* and his Parliament to be rebels, and who were notoriouſly in a ſtate of open rebellion at the time? And was this declaration of protection and encouragement of *rebels* to be made with impunity? Nothing was ſo diſgraceful to the adminiſtration of Lord North, as the toleration of this abuſe and profligacy, which nearly amounted to treaſon, and the forbearance to impeach the man who dared to utter ſuch language.

The war which was entered into for the purpoſe of puniſhing theſe rebels, and for reſtoring them to a proper ſenſe of duty to their ſovereign, Mr. Fox aſſerts to have been only a war "to gratify that party which exiſted then, *and exiſts now in this country*; a party that hates liberty, and would employ the arms of this nation to ſuppreſs it wherever it has diffuſed its bleſſings or endeavours to extend its influence!!!"—As we are neither intoxicated with the fumes of wine, as might probably be the caſe with Mr. Fox's Whig friends, nor have yet drunk of the waters of Lethe, we can very well recollect what that *party* was *which exiſted then*, and what that *party* is which *exiſts now in this country*. The firſt was the party which compoſed Lord North's adminiſtration, and ſupported the American war; the laſt, the party which compoſed Mr. Pitt's adminiſtration, and ſupported the preſent war. Now at the head of this laſt party are many of thoſe men who acted with Mr. Fox in oppoſition to the miniſtry of that day, and who, according to his own acknowledgment, were as great friends to liberty as himſelf, while very few of the former party have been in power ſince the preſent war; and that party, it muſt never be forgotten, *that hated liberty*, was the very party with which he afterwards *coaleſced* and *acted!*

We paſs over the ſtale tricks of aſſerting that the war is carried on for the ſole purpoſe of reſtoring the Houſe of Bourbon, in defiance of truth, and in contradiction to the moſt ſolemn and repeated declarations of his Majeſty's Miniſters in both Houſes of Parliament; of inſiſting

that

that this country has "*neither intereſt nor juſtice*" in the conteſt; and of imputing the high price of proviſions, and every other poſſible evil, to the encreaſe of the *circulating medium*, and that to the war. Theſe paltry manœuvres of faction are beneath Mr. Fox; he ſhould leave them to Citizen Waithman, and other Whigs of inferior note, and confine himſelf to the higher and bolder flights of Whiggiſm, ſuch as thoſe which remain to be noticed. Adverting to the Iriſh Rebellion, and the means taken for its ſuppreſſion, he tells us, "From what has happened in a neighbouring country, it appears ſtill more clearly, that there is a fixed and ſyſtematic plan for depreſſing the cauſe of liberty, and enſlaving the people."—Anglicé, for cruſhing rebellion, and compelling ſubjects to obey the laws. "*Tumults were excited* by the moſt unjuſtifiable meaſures, and afterwards were quelled by means of the *moſt dreadful atrocities*. Villages were ſet on fire; torture, in its moſt horrid forms, was employed to gain diſcoveries, and military power was freed of all controul from civil authority." We ſhould have ſuppoſed that Mr. Fox was here drawing an accurate picture of the French Republic, had not *Ireland* been ſpecifically mentioned in the next line. He would not dare to utter ſuch atrocious falſhoods, to pronounce ſo groſs a libel on the loyal proteſtants of Ireland, in his ſeat in the Houſe, where he would now meet with men, who, having a perſonal knowledge of all the facts of the Rebellion, would not ſuffer him to paſs ſo ſcandalous an impoſition on the public unanſwered nor unexpoſed. In one thing only is Mr. Fox *conſiſtent*, in his uniform ſupport of rebellion. He ſupported the American rebels, he has ſupported the French rebels, and he has ſupported the Iriſh rebels—but to proceed. "I muſt ſay, that in *every* country, the *legitimate ſovereign is the people*; and that only in proportion as governments are the genuine repreſentatives of that ſovereign they are *legitimate*." As this neither is, nor poſſibly can be, the caſe in any monarchy, however limited or modified, or indeed in any conceivable ſtate but a perfect democracy, which never did nor never can exiſt, it follows of neceſſity, that our gracious Monarch is not the *legitimate* ſovereign of theſe realms. This is ſomething more than faction, it borders ſo cloſely upon treaſon, that had it been uttered by another, and Mr. Fox had been in power, he would, we are perſuaded, have made it the ſubject of an *impeachment*. If ſuch indeed were the genuine Whig creed, as Mr. Fox maintains, if ſuch, indeed, were "the Whig principles," as he aſſerts, "which brought about the Revolution of 1688, and which alone could juſtify it," it would be a neceſſary and inevitable conſequence, that *Whigs* and *Rebels*, *Revolution* and *Rebellion*, are ſynonimous terms. But, as we ſhould look in vain, we conceive, for any ſuch principles as theſe in the public proceedings of that period, we muſt follow Mr. Fox up to his concluſion, that "the Revolution of 1688 could not be juſtified." We leave his partizans of the Whig Club to extricate him from this pitiable dilemma.

As a good thing cannot be too often repeated, the orator again brings forward his political creed, at the concluſion of his ſpeech."

"I ſhall

"I shall ever maintain that the basis of all constitutions is the SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE; and that from the people *alone*, Kings, Parliaments, Judges, and Magistrates, derive *all* their authority."!!! If this Whig leader and his Whig associates ever went to *Church*, they would there acquire, from the regular service of the sabbath, a more accurate idea of their King by learning "*whose* minister he is" and "*whose* authority he has." They would be taught also, that it is an old trick of the Devil to tempt men to distrust God, and place his trust *in the people*. But this, perhaps, is too much to expect from them. Some other means therefore should be resorted to for producing a renunciation, or rather to prevent the publication, of doctrines, of which it is difficult to say whether impiety or folly be the leading characteristic.—The newly created *sovereignty of subjects* and *subjection of sovereigns*, has something so truly preposterous in it, that, were it not for the habits of insubordination which it is calculated, and, generally, *intended* to encourage, it might safely be left for the amusement of suckling Whigs.

The *Chief Magistrate of the city of London*—strange to say—was present at this meeting, and expressly sanctioned all the principles and declarations of Mr. Fox. To say that Mr. *Erskine* was there, is to say that he spoke, and about *himself*. But he did more, for, *ridabile dictu!* he lost himself for a moment, in the extravagant compliments which he lavished on his *second-self*, Mr. Fox.—He let the cat out of the bag, however, by admitting that the object of the Whigs was—*to rouse the dormant energies of an infatuated people*; a phrase which, we suspect, he pilfered from the debates of the French Convention, after the 10th of August, 1792.—He pledged himself for the *sincerity* of the First Consul in his offers of peace;—and observed that Mr. Fox had "retired from public labours *to the repose of domestic life*."—Who that heard or read this account of the recluse of St. Ann's Hill, would not suppose that he had actually retired to enjoy the *otium cum dignitate*, the fruits of a well-spent life, an honourable independence, and the social converse of a virtuous wife and an amiable family!—And who will not reprobate this hypocritical cant, that knows, that this leader of the Whigs has basely deserted his parliamentary duty, solely because his voice has not prevailed in the house, and his opinions have not been adopted by the cabinet;—and that he now subsists on the produce of an eleemosynary contribution, in the constant commission of sin, without the excuse of youth or the temptation of passion, surrounded by the partner of his illicit amours, and a spurious offspring!—

After reading this pamplet, every man must implicitly subscribe to the justice of Mr. Fox's assertion that "dreadful encroachments have been made on the liberty of the press," and that "*now* the most slavish and intolerable silence is imposed!" Our readers, we apprehend, will readily acknowledge that the pamphlet required particular notice; and that had we passed it over without such notice, we should have been guilty of a shameful breach of duty. But the *Monthly Reviewers* seem to entertain a different idea of the

object

object of criticiſm and the duties of a critic. In their Number for November laſt, they gave a *review* of the pamphlet, which we ſhall extract in toto.

"With a *ſtrong and penetrating mind*, Mr. Fox here reviews the circumſtances of the war; makes an open and undiſtinguiſhed avowal of his political principles; and declares, that, in his opinion, the war is the *principal cauſe* of the high price of proviſions."

We have taught theſe reviewers the *policy* of caution, at leaſt; they were aware any thing they might ſay on this hopeful publication, would not elude our vigilance, nor eſcape our animadverſions; and, therefore, they have forborne to *commit* themſelves on the ſubject, and are contented to give an indirect ſtimulus to the circulation of the miſchief, by ſtating it to be the production of *a ſtrong and penetrating mind*. If this be accepted by *their* readers, for *criticiſm*, we ſhall only congratulate them on having readers ſo little faſtidious, and ſo eaſily ſatisfied.

The Diffuſion of Divine Truth. A Sermon, preached before the Religious Tract Society, on the Lord's Day, May 18. 1800, *and publiſhed at their Requeſt.* By David Bogue. 8vo. 6d. Williams. London. 1800.

A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Hanover Square, Newcaſtle, for the Support of the New College, Manchester. By William Turner. 8vo. 1s. Johnſon. London. 1800.

DIVINITY being my profeſſion, I turn with peculiar intereſt to that part of a Review, which gives us, under the head of *religion*, ſome account of the *ſingle ſermons* of the day. I have paid particular attention to this department of the *Critical Review* for *November* laſt. It commences with a pair of critiques on ſermons by authors who ſtile themſelves, the one *David Bogue*, the other *William Turner*. No title of *Rev.* precedes the name of either, and there is no mark of any *degree* which follows. Their diſcourſes, however, are ſo excellent in the eyes of *Critical Reviewers*, that no leſs than *one hundred and five* lines are occupied by their praiſes, and the extracts which have been drawn from them. The two next ſermons are publications of clergymen of the Church of England. But, though it is acknowledged of the one, that *the language is chaſte, the ſentiments liberal, the arrangement neat and luminous*; and though it is predicated of the other, that it is *a diſcourſe elegantly written, and the argument well ſupported*; yet are we indulged with no extract from either, and *ten ſolitary lines* contain all the notice which can be afforded to both. Such diſtinction and preference being given to the two preachers *without degrees*, and (if we may judge from their ſtile and title) *without ordination* alſo, our curioſity is naturally excited to know who they are, and of what their ſuperior excellence conſiſts. The firſt, it ſeems, is well known for *his attachment to the miſſionary preachers* who attempted to

eſtabliſh

eſtabliſh themſelves in the Friendly Iſlands; and, if report err not, was at one time on the point of *deſerting* his own extenſive and *reputable congregation* at Goſport, and uniting himſelf with them. The other ſwells his diſcourſe with a *liberal* hiſtory of *non-conformity*; and his object is to promote the cauſe of a religious *expiring ſeminary of nonconformiſts*. Par nobile fratrum.

With reſpect to *doctrine*, the former of theſe preachers is particularly impreſſive to the *Critical Reviewers*, becauſe he laughs at the progreſs of *atheiſm*. *Some*, ſays he, *are dreadfully afraid of infidelity. The alarm has far exceeded reality.* In conformity to this ſentiment, while his colleague *William Turner* unluckily complains *(ſuch harmony is in* diſſenting *ſouls!)* of the *deluge of infidelity*, David Bogue maintains that *there never was a country where one tenth part of the people were Atheiſts*. Such doctrine, Mr. Editor, could not fail to pleaſe critics, who wiſh us to conſider *jacobins* as mere phantoms of the miniſterial brain. The latter, I have already noticed, it is their plan *non credendo corroborare*; and the former they well know to be characters ſo ſtrictly and inſeparably allied with *jacobins*, that it may be juſtly diſputed whether they are not always one and the ſame. They, therefore, who queſtion the exiſtence of the one, will naturally plead for the non-exiſtence of the other. Hence the doubts, which the Critical Reviewers have attached to Mr. Reid's *Riſe and Diſſolution of the Infidel Societies*; on which they remark, *our readers had no idea that infidelity had been ſo organiſed in this metropolis*. But, Mr. Editor, are not writers, who betray ſuch a determined diſpoſition to be ſceptical,* themſelves a ſtrong proof that *infidelity* really does exiſt? *Nemo repentè fuit turpiſſimus*: the progreſs to depravity of every kind is gradual. The laſt thing a man diſbelieves is the truth of revelation. He begins firſt to be an infidel in matters of leſs moment. He perhaps doubts of the exiſtence of Troy: he fancies, with the Jeſuit Hardouin, that the works of the ancient profane and eccleſiaſtical writers are, with a few exceptions, mere forgeries. If a philoſopher, he does not believe in the exiſtence of *matter*; if a politician, he diſcredits every report of conſpiracy, and will not allow that any man can have had wicked deſigns, who has been diſmiſſed from the bar without being *found guilty*. So far have the Critical Reviewers certainly advanced into infidelity, that they venture, in the face of poſitive evidence, to deny what nothing but ocular demonſtration can make more certain. Men, endued with ſuch a diſpoſition of mind, are much nearer than they imagine to complete and perfect infidelity. He who doubts, like John Hardouin, the veracity of Homer, will ſoon diſpute the truth of Moſes; and diſbelief in Moſes will be naturally followed by ſuſpicion of the reſt of the ſacred writers. So again, he who can diſpute the exiſtence of *matter*,

* The Critical Reviewers are very inconſiſtent. In their Review for December, p. 462, they admit that *infidelity is inceſſantly endeavouring to undermine the holy truths of our religion.*

will

will ſoon explode every idea of *ſpirit*; and, being blind to *viſible effect*, he cannot be long expected to admit of *an inviſible cauſe*. In the ſame manner, they who ſtill maintain the innocence of certain unconvicted members of the Correſponding Society; and who, till he confeſſed his guilt, were infidels as to the atrocious deſigns of Mr. Arthur O'Connor and his aſſociates; they who declare jacobins and infidels to be *airy nothing*, to which timidity and alarm have given *a local habitation and a name*, are not far from diſputing the exiſtence of more auguſt perſonages, *angels, archangels, and all the company of heaven*. For it is an argument, which has been applied with wonderful force by the author of our ſalvation, that if we believe not *earthly things* of which we are *told*, when the evidence is ſufficient and the veracity of the reporter unimpeachable; it is impoſſible that we can believe *heavenly things*, be the announcer of them whom he may. Religious *faith* is *the evidence of things not ſeen*; which, of courſe, cannot long dwell in a boſom already diſpoſed to doubt of things that *are ſeen*, however they may be teſtified.

The doctrine of the ſecond of theſe preachers, namely, *William Turner*, is equally well adapted to the taſte of the Critical Reviewers. He addreſſes his auditors as *proteſtant Diſſenters*; and propoſes, in laying down the plan of his ſermon (yes, Mr. Editor, the plan of his *ſermon)* to give a ſhort *hiſtory of the Engliſh non-conformiſts*. His profeſſed object is to encourage a due ſupply of *public inſtructors*, for *one claſs* at leaſt of theſe *non-conformiſts*, the claſs of the defunct academy at Warrington. In proſecuting this edifying ſubject, the author feelingly laments, that it ſhould have ſuited the policy of the *civil power, to adopt the Chriſtian profeſſion as an engine of ſtate*. He inſinuates that it has been *made a convenient handle to ſerve political purpoſes*, even in our own country: but he forbears to mention, that *the Diſſenters* of the ſeventeenth century were, of all Chriſtians, the moſt notorious, in making it *an engine of ſtate* and *a handle for political purpoſes*. From the time when it became an engine of ſtate, the author affirms that the great apoſtacy began; that *the ſpirit* and *principles of the Goſpel were gradually adulterated*; that *its teachers degenerated into worldly-minded prieſts, caballing and intriguing for power*; and that *the people at large grew every day more ignorant and corrupt*. Such the author would have his audience underſtand to be the natural conſequence of eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments, and the uncontroulable reſult of the union of church and ſtate. We may, perhaps, Mr. Editor, with greater juſtice attribute ſuch evils, to that inordinate luſt of diſſention, which poured in upon us at the reformation. Men were not contented with moderate and rational reform; but, like the political innovators of France, they were for rejecting whatever had the ſlighteſt ſavour of the ancient regime, whether good or bad. The *wiſdom* as well as the *folly* of papacy, the *ſound doctrines* as well as the *errors* of the church of Rome, were by ſome hot-headed zealots impugned and condemned; and the very *garments* of the prieſthood, the very *ornaments* of their perſons and their *places of worſhip*, became heterodox.

Freedom of animadverſion created licentiouſneſs of opinion; and one ſect was followed by another, until Chriſtianity inſtead of being the bond of peace and union, ſeemed to be the very apple of contention, about which (to uſe Dr. Aikin's expreſſion) *men were made to differ*. Hence has originated that mixture of capable and incapable preachers among us, by which *the ſpirit and principles of the Goſpel have been adulterated*. From the ſame cauſe ſprung alſo that union of politics and religion, which has ſet the pulpits of Diſſenters in battle array againſt the pulpits of the eſtabliſhed church. Preachers of this deſcription have always a view to the overthrow of the church of England; they are *worldly-minded enough* to long for a ſecond taſte of thoſe good things, that ſweet prey, that palatable thievery, from which they were obliged to recede ſo reluctantly in the days of Yore. Their affections are ſet on things *below*; they wiſh to revenge that privation which they have never forgiven; and hence comes *caballing and intriguing for power*. A natural conſequence of the oppoſition thus conſtantly made to the doctrines of the eſtabliſhed church; a natural conſequence of ſchiſm, organiſed in ten thouſand ſhapes, and ramified into diſtinctions that are numberleſs, is, that *the people at large grow every day more ignorant*, and, as they grow ignorant, they become *corrupt*. Many times, indeed, we ſee them attending conventicles, where, from the manifeſt ignorance of the preachers, nothing can be learned: and if they abandon theſe for meeting-houſes of a higher deſcription, they enter them to hear of the hardſhips and injuries of non-conformiſts, inſtead of the ſufferings of their Saviour.

The reformation of the church of England, William Turner informs us, was at firſt *little more than popery in an Engliſh dreſs*. That is, it did not ſpring ſuddenly from one extreme to the other; it did not affect *purity* which was impoſſible, and preciſion which was minutely ridiculous. It did not, like the Puritan, abandon its *Saint's day*; nor, like the philoſopher, aboliſh its *Sabbath*. It did not, like the puritan, *annihilate* its form of prayer, but *correct* and *reform* it: it did not, like the philoſopher, condemn its *whole* code of regulations to the flames, but ſuch *parts* only as more mature reflection had taught it to explode. May we not very juſtly ſay of ſuch conduct, in the words of the old ſong, *Oh! what wonderful moderation*! while, in the words of the ſame ſong, we may as juſtly ridicule the intemperate ſpirit of innovation which belongs to the puritan and philoſopher, by exclaiming *alteration, alteration, Oh what wonderful alteration!*

Speaking of *ſupremacy* in matters of religion, William Turner actually denies that the Pope has a title to it. But why does he add, that NO MAN *can have the ſmalleſt right to exerciſe* ſuch ſupremacy *over the religious belief or profeſſion of the meaneſt of mankind?* See, Mr. Editor, the bleſſed conſequences of republicaniſm in religion. It ſeems, that to be a leveller in church, naturally diſpoſes a man to be a leveller in ſtate. He who maintains that there ſhould be no biſhops, will of courſe ſhortly vote the reſt of the Houſe of Lords

Lords to be uſeleſs. He who acknowledges no *eccleſiaſtical ſupreme*, will ſoon doubt whether there be occaſion for a *civil ſupreme*. And here, perhaps, William Turner has furniſhed us with the means of accounting for the martydom of Charles I. If the Diſſenters, even at that time, held that the king had no right to be eſteemed *the head of the church*; it did not require any very great ſtretch of conſcience to maintain that he had as little right to be *head of the ſtate*.

But though the reformation of Harry VIII. amounted to little more, in the eſtimation of William Turner, than *Popery in an Engliſh dreſs*, he allows that SOME *excellent tranſlations of the Scriptures were made in his reign*; *which, in many inſtances* (continues he) *are far from having been improved upon, by the ſubſtitution of that which we now uſe*. This ſentiment could not fail to pleaſe Critical Reviewers, who love to ſee a bolt ſhot at the eſtabliſhment. Our preſent tranſlation of the Scriptures, Mr. Editor, is only offenfive to Diſſenters, becauſe it was executed by clergymen of the church of England. Had we ſtill retained what was called the *Biſhop's* bible, which was the work of fourteen Biſhops, it would doubtleſs have been a verſion ſtill more exceptionable. Our bible, in its preſent form, is deſpiſed, by Diſſenters, for the reaſon above mentioned; and alſo becauſe it profeſſed to *follow* the *Biſhops'* verſion where it was worthy of being followed, and to reject the fine ſpun puritanical gloſſes of Geneva. Nevertheleſs, by ſuch means was a tranſlation of very great excellence obtained. I aſk pardon of the ſhades of Lowth and Newcomb, I claim living forgiveneſs of Blaney and Wintle, when I aſſert that I am far from being perſuaded, that their ſeveral tranſlations, united, would be preferable to the good old verſion which they have been ſo ſtudious to improve; and which they have undoubtedly in many reſpects illuſtrated.

Edward VI. meets with more mercy than his father from the pen of William Turner, for having made *ſome attempts to ſimplify the forms of public worſhip*. The *ſimplifiers of public worſhip* were, however, obliged to fly at the acceſſion of his Roman Catholic ſiſter; and had now an opportunity of being *ſtruck with the greater ſimplicity* of the worſhip of their Proteſtant brethren *abroad*. Said *ſimplicity*, at Mary's death, *ſome* wiſhed to import into England; and were deſirous *to reduce the forms of their own church to a ſimilar ſtandard*. *Others*, being not yet childiſh enough to be in love with *foreign ſimplicity*, retained (Oh! ſhocking propenſity to popery!) their predilection to the *ceremonies and veſtments* to which they had been accuſtomed. And Elizabeth (a ſilly queen, not to love the *ſimplifiers*) warmly ſided with the *latter* party. Yes—*ſhe had her father's ſpirit—ſhe exerciſed the very ſeverities ſhe had eſcaped—ſhe oppreſſed a body of men, who were ſo exemplary in their conduct, as to obtain from their leſs ſcrupulous* (that is, leſs *ſimplified*) *neighbours, the appellation of Puritans*. William Turner is right. Queen Beſs hated a Puritan. She ſeverely reproved an Oxford doctor, publickly, for being *ſo ſtrait-laced*. To her averſion from Puritans, we are perhaps to aſcribe that freedom in her conduct, which could

prompt her to be *at a play on a Sunday evening*, when ſhe had abſented herſelf from *the ſermon in the morning*. That ſhe had *good reaſon* to be diſpleaſed with the Puritans, William Turner himſelf has accidentally informed us, when he ſays, that the Puritans had NATURALLY *proceeded from indulging a greater freedom of enquiry on religious ſubjects, to form at the ſame time* MORE ENLARGED NOTIONS OF CIVIL LIBERTY. In fact, Mr. Editor, they mixed *politics* with *religion*, like their deſcendants of the preſent day; and this conduct William Turner allows to have been *natural*. I moſt heartily maintain the ſame, and plead that he has confirmed my poſition, that *a republican in church* becomes of courſe *a republican in ſtate*. When David Hume aſſerts that *the ſpark of liberty was kindled, and preſerved by the Puritans* (*a ſect whoſe principles appear to him ſo frivolous and their habits ſo ridiculous*) he acknowledges (and it is Scottiſh teſtimony) that they ever had a wiſh to *ſimplify* us in *ſtate* as well as in *church*: when, however, that author maintains, that to the Puritans *we owe the whole freedom of our conſtitution*, I am of William Turner's opinion that *he pays them a very overſtrained compliment*. As well may we attribute to the Whig Club, to the Correſponding Society, or to the minority of a certain legiſlative aſſembly, our preſent independence. That they have *negatively* preſerved us, I grant; for they have not ſuffered the true patriot to ſleep at his poſt. But if we have hitherto been admirably *piloted*, and if our *veſſel* is yet *water-tight*, and may bid defiance to *the tempeſt that impends*, the chief merit is due to the ſkill of our *Palinuri*. Not a tittle of it can belong to thoſe, who have wiſhed only to *run us aground*, and to turn us from *the right courſe*, by for ever ſhouting *breakers-a-head*; though their officious impertinence has ſerved to promote a good *look out*, and prevented us from being *ſhip-wrecked* through ſupineneſs.

The Puritans of the reign of Elizabeth, William Turner informs us, were the anceſtors of the preſent Britiſh non-conformiſts. At that time, he tells us, *they differed in form rather than in ſubſtance from their epiſcopal brethren—they wiſhed rather to* SIMPLIFY *the public worſhip of the church, and to form its government on a more* POPULAR *and* EQUAL *plan, than to alter the doctrines held forth in its articles*. I am afraid, Mr. Editor, this is no juſt picture of their deſcendants. They ſeem now to differ from us more in *ſubſtance* than in *form*; and ſuch is their zeal to *ſimplify us*, that they wiſh for a plan more *popular* and *equal* in our *civil* as well as in our *eccleſiaſtical* departments. Nor would they be content with an alteration of our *articles*, but they would require us to *ſimplify* even our *creeds* and our *liturgy*, to make them digeſtible by the cold Puritan ſtomach.

EQUAL *religious liberty*, continues William Turner, had not yet emerged from *the darkneſs of corrupted Chriſtianity*. If, Sir, all who oppoſe Puritans, are to be conſidered as *buried in the darkneſs of corrupted Chriſtianity*, there never can exiſt *equal religious liberty* under a Puritan government. Indeed the author is candid enough to allow, that *the Puritans, when in power, were equally ſtrangers*

to the juſt principles of toleration, with thoſe whom they had ſupplanted. If a *Diſſenter* acknowledge them to have been at leaſt *equally*, we may venture to pronounce that they were *more than equally, ſtrangers to toleration.*

The uſurper *Cromwell* is next appealed to, by William Turner, *for his enlarged notions of* religious *liberty.* I agree with him that *Oliver's* is *curious* authority; and it is equally *curious*, that a writer who queſtions the *pope's* and the *king's* right of *ſupremacy*, ſhould at once ſubſcribe to the ſupremacy of Cromwell, and treat his opinion as *infallible.* 'In matters of religion,' ſays this pope of the Puritans, 'all men have an equal right to think and act for themſelves. While they live in peace with the reſt of mankind, they are free to diſſent from the magiſtrate and the prieſt.' Such, Mr. Editor, is Pope Oliver's bull; and we may conſider it as the Puritan's *thirty-nine articles* "fidei et religionis," to which no Diſſenter has any objection to ſubſcribe. If, after the publication of ſuch doctrine, *the temper of the times* was ſuch, that even Oliver could not entirely prevent the different ſects from *biting and devouring each other—if each in its turn vented its malice againſt the reſt, and againſt the fallen epiſcopal church*, to what was ſuch conduct owing but to the Arch-puritan's having himſelf thus publickly maintained *the ſacred right of inſurrection?* For if men are inſtructed that they have a right to *act* as well as to *think*; if they are declared to be at liberty *to diſſent from the magiſtrate* as well as from the *prieſt*; it will avail nothing to add that they muſt *live at peace* withal, for *peace* is abſolutely incompatible with ſuch a ſtate of warfare. Opinions are armed againſt each other, the ſhout of onſet is given, and the conflict of anarchy is begun.

In the *reſtoration*, ſays William Turner, *the Preſbyterians, weary of the diſtractions which had ſo long prevailed, joined* EQUALLY *with the members of the Epiſcopal church. It might have been hoped*, proceeds he, *that both parties would have learned wiſdom by paſt experience, and mutually agreed to bury in oblivion the injuries they had inflicted on each other.* This, Sir, is the uſual outcry of the vanquiſhed; who, having run their career of cruelty, no ſooner find the tide of ſucceſs turned againſt them, than they preach up the beauty of moderation and forgiveneſs, although in their proſperity they forgot to be exemplary in the practice of either. *But the minds of men*, ſays the author, *were not yet ſufficiently expanded. The ſufferings of the clergy were returned with tenfold vengeance upon the non-conformiſts.* And how were they returned, Mr. Editor? What unheard of cruelties did the church of England practiſe, when reſtored to her former poſſeſſions? Did ſhe tie the Diſſenters to the ſtake? did ſhe ſet up a guillotine? did ſhe condemn them to the axe? to the halter? or even ſend them into exile for the wrongs ſhe had ſuſtained? No. Of what, then, did her *tenfold vengeance* conſiſt? Hear William Turner. She *re-eſtabliſhed* (oh horrible to relate!) *the* BOOK *of* COMMON PRAYER, *and the ancient* EPISCOPAL FORMS, *with ſeveral* ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS. What the author implies by *additional reſtrictions* we need not enquire, ſince

the expreſſion manifeſtly covers the *leſſer* grievances of the Diſſenters; a long *et cætera* of hardſhips, of *inferior* cruelty to *the reeſtabliſhment of biſhops and the common prayer-book*. If, at the reſtoration of the biſhops and the common prayer, *two thouſand* puritanical *miniſters reſigned the means of their ſubſiſtence*; that is, gave up the livings they held, *rather than violate the dictates of their conſciences*; without inquiring into the means by which they obtained them, and their right of holding them, I will pronounce this part of their conduct to be honourable. But if *tenderneſs of conſcience* alone was the cauſe of this original ſeparation from the church of England, which has ſubſiſted ever ſince in the perſons of thoſe Diſſenters whoſe cauſe William Turner has undertaken to plead; how is it that their deſcendants are become ſo *looſely laced* as the preacher has repreſented? *Whatever may be their own ſentiments*, ſays he, *the miniſters of this claſs endeavour, in their reſpective congregations, to render it eaſy for Chriſtians of all denominations to attend them without offence. It is their wiſh to conſider perſons there aſſembled, not as Epiſcopalians, Preſbyterians, Independents, Calviniſts, Arminians, Trinitarians, Unitarians, Baptiſts, or Pædobaptiſts, but as ſo many individual Chriſtians. On this principle it is their endeavour to model their devotional ſervices; without the moſt diſtant wiſh to impoſe their own ſentiments upon any ſingle hearer.* How changed, therefore, how fallen from the tenets of their rigid forefathers, are theſe compromiſing preachers of our days! How are their narrow conſciences expanded, and *enlarged without meaſure!* They who could formerly refuſe to worſhip God, according to the ſentiments of the great majority of the nation, and the wiſdom of her repreſentatives in parliament aſſembled, can, in more modern times, ſervilely bow with the utmoſt reſpect to the opinions of any ſect, however ſenſible they may be of its errors. They are no longer, Mr. Editor, to be deemed *non-conformiſts*, ſave only as that title regards the better doctrines and wiſer regulations of the church of England. With reſpect to every thing that is *ſectarian*, be it however fond and abſurd, they are *conformiſts*. They are ANYTHINGARIANS; they are EVERYTHINGARIANS: and coaleſce with all Chriſtians freely but the church of England. And why do they thus meanly flatter the weakneſs of every ſectary, and forbear to reprove him for his errors? Why do they wiſh to combine all ſectaries in a maſs, and to make one united body of all the Diſſenters in the kingdom? It proceeds, Mr. Editor, from a hope of being ſome day able to aſſail parliament in ſuch numbers, that it ſhall not dare to deny to them the repeal of the teſt-act, and the removal of other obſtacles which ſtand in the way of their ambition. For it is an hereditary opinion of theſe men, that they have always been *haraſſed with ſevere laws and vindictive perſecutions* (I uſe William Turner's words); though, in my opinion, the reſtrictions impoſed upon them have ever been mild and ſalutary, and extremely ſorry ſhall I be to ſee them removed.

It is to provide ſucceſſors in the miniſtry of this claſs (a class which avowedly has NO CREED as a term of communion) that William Turner

Turner ſolicits the liberal contributions of his hearers. In this part of his diſcourſe, it is curious to hear him inadvertently ſpeak of *the churches* of Presbyterians, and of *the advantages of an University education.* After dwelling with minuteneſs upon the catalogue of learned Diſſenters, he adds, that *it is an object of, at leaſt, excuſable ambition to attempt the continuance of an order of men, who have deſerved ſo well of their reſpective ſocieties, and of the Chriſtian world at large.*

But, having pleaded that *the continuance of an order of learned and able miniſters is an object of great importance,* the preacher involves himſelf in a dilemma, from which he makes many very aukward ſtruggles to diſentangle himſelf. *Far am I,* ſays he, *from wiſhing to claim for learning any* UNDUE *pre-eminence or authority. Far am I from wiſhing to undervalue the labours of many excellent men, who, with* ONLY A KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR NATIVE TONGUE, *have devoted themſelves to* INSTRUCT *the ignorant. Far am I from aſſerting that learning is* NECESSARY *to a right underſtanding of the Scriptures, or from denying to any one who underſtands the Goſpel, his undoubted* RIGHT *to* TEACH *it.* Conformity to the whims and fancies of ſectaries of every deſcription, William Turner had before informed us, is the leading principle of modern Diſſenters. He is, therefore, obliged to *ſay* and to *unſay* fine things of learning, leſt he ſhould diſguſt that great *majority* of ſchiſmatics, who, being extremely ignorant, like a preacher the better for being as deficient as themſelves. Far be it from *us*, Mr. Editor, to aſſert that learning is *not neceſſary to a right underſtanding of the Scriptures.* As far be it from us, to maintain that a *knowledge of our native tongue alone* is a ſufficient qualification to enable us to underſtand the divine writers thoroughly. But fartheſt of all be it from us, to admit that *any man,* be his qualifications few or many, *has an undoubted right to teach the Goſpel.* St. Paul, with all his attainments, never opens his lips to inſtruct others, without a ſolemn declaration that he has been formally *appointed an apoſtle* for that purpoſe; or, to uſe his own word, *ſent.* All his ſpeeches and all his Epiſtles, eſpecially in their *firſt* verſes, ſtudiouſly inculcate that he has *received ordination* to act in the capacity of a preacher; and that he has not taken upon himſelf to aſſociate with the regularly conſtituted miniſters of God's word, and to partake of their miniſtry, without ſpecial and palpable appointment. Says not the ſame learned Apoſtle in general terms of *all* miniſters of religion, *How ſhall they preach except they be* SENT? The words of the original Greek are here very ſtrong, and cannot by any ſectarian artifice be *ſimplified* into a ſenſe leſs ſubſtantial than this; that *no man can have an undoubted right to teach the Goſpel, until authorized by the Church.* They, therefore, who undertake to preach of their own accord, have a moſt awful account to render for their preſumption. If they are poorly qualified for the office, their tranſgreſſion is aggravated. Far, very far, is a knowledge of our *native tongue alone* from being ſufficient to lead us to a *right* underſtanding of the Scriptures. When William Turner aſſerted that it was ſufficient, he contradicted himſelf: for he had before condemned our Engliſh Verſion of the Scriptures as deficient in accuracy, and poſitively aſſerts afterwards

that it *was made by men very much under the influence of system.* If these facts are *true*, it must follow, of necessity, that none are competent to the exposition of the Scriptures, but they who are able to read them in their original tongues. I have, however, already denied the inaccuracy of our English bible in general, and I question its having been corrupted by *the influence of system.* Nevertheless, I will not hold that acquaintance with a translation only, however excellent, can qualify any man whatever, to pronounce with sufficient exactness on the sense of the original. I must ever be of opinion that, learned as the established clergy are, and infinitely as they surpass the generality of sectarian preachers in knowledge, they are yet to be deemed a little short of that standard in attainments, which an accomplished minister ought always to reach. To understand the New Testament, ought not the Hellenistic Greek to be particularly studied? To understand the Hellenistic Greek, have we not occasion for an accurate knowledge of that Greek into which the Hebrew is transfused by the seventy-two interpreters; which forms the basis of the language of the New Testament? To understand that Greek, is it not requisite that we know the Hebrew, as well at least as the divines of the *fifteenth* and *sixteenth* centuries? To comprehend the Hebrew, shall we not have need of some insight into the Chaldean, Syriac, and Arabic languages, to mention no more? If from these fountain heads we trace the sense of Scripture through all its windings, and never lose sight of its meandering course, till we come down to the Gospels, it may be presumed that we are well qualified, for the interpretation of the Evangelists and Apostles. Without knowledge to this extent, all ministers of the word must be, more or less, unworthy of their office, according to their several degrees of deficiency. If they know nothing of those tongues, they *cannot always understand* the Gospel; they are even in momentary danger of blundering, and it is right that they should be *excluded* from the regular ministry. But if, notwithstanding such exclusion, some are still so vain and infatuated, as to pretend to *teach*, in spite of their *ignorance* of what they affect to *understand*, the mouths of such mischievous empirics, such mountebanks in divinity, should be stopped by LAW.

To give farther countenance to *illiterate* preachers, William Turner observes that the Gospel *was preached, by its original founder, to the poor; and many* POOR *men were first employed in spreading it: but men of erudition and taste*, says he, *were also employed.* Did it never occur to William Turner, that the POOR men, selected for this purpose, were endued with all the advantages of liberal education, before they were suffered to preach? Are they any longer *men destitute of letters*, when they begin *to instruct* their fellow-creatures? Are they not rather ministers who are become, by a miracle, *extremely learned?* Where is the Apostle, in these days, who is so well qualified, *by his critical skill in languages*, as they were? And if there was no profit arising from all this superiority of knowledge, why does St. Paul so often pique himself upon the advantages of *his* education? why does he so triumphantly exclaim, *I thank my God I speak*

with tongues more than you all? So far from allowing that POOR and ILLITERATE men have had any preference, in appointment to the priesthood, I quote the instance of Christ's selecting his Apostles from *the meanest* of men, to shew that *such men can only be qualified by miracle;* they can only be rendered competent by the laying on of the hands of Christ himself. At all other times, and in the *absence* (if I may so speak) of our Lord, it has manifestly been signified, that we are *not* to elect our priesthood from the dregs of society. The priesthood of Israel was *dignified.* Many are the regulations of the divine law, which provide for its respectability. And when Jeroboam *consecrated* and ordained whoever chose to minister, when he repeatedly *made of the lowest of the people priests;* are we not informed that *this thing became* SIN *unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off, and to destroy it from off the face of the earth?*

There is one qualification, Mr. Editor, which the Apostles derived from the gift of tongues, which I believe has never been adverted to: as it is peculiarly deserving of the attention of those illiterate preachers of whom I am speaking, I cannot forbear to notice it. The Apostles, it must be first observed, were *all* men born in a remote part of the Holy land; in that part of it which was most distant from the capital, Jerusalem. This region of Palestine having been long since over-run, a mixed kind of Syriac had been introduced into it; which was, in many respects, essentially different from the Syriac spoken in Jerusalem. To this rude language had the Apostles been accustomed from their childhood, and, being poor and destitute of the means of procuring education, may be reasonably supposed to have contracted all its barbarisms. Of the nature of these barbarisms, any of your readers, Sir, may obtain a competent idea, by consulting Lightfoot. They were such, that the Apostle who denied his master, evasively answered the high-priest's maid, by saying 'I know not, neither *understand* I what thou sayest;' affecting to hide himself in the peculiar obscurity of his dialect. She, on the contrary, tells him, 'thy *speech* bewrayeth thee.' The Apostles had, it seems, contracted the brogue of that part of Palestine in which they were born; and could no more disguise their origin from a native of Judea, than a poor Scotchman or Irishman could adopt the stile of an inhabitant of London. It was, perhaps, the most remarkable part of the miracle, that this provincial defect was remedied by the descent of the Holy Ghost. For we are very particularly informed that, after the gift of tongues, the Apostles were enabled to speak like *dwellers in* JUDEA; and hence it was, that such striking effect was produced by the subsequent speech of Peter, whose *language* had so lately *bewrayed* him. From this extraordinary circumstance, is manifestly to be deduced this important *truth:* that God does not approve of such men being made the vehicles of his word, who are likely to disgrace it by the *vulgarity* of their discourse. And if the Holy Spirit thought proper to correct such a defect, in men whom it had set apart as *travelling* instructors of mankind, may we not reasonably expect from Mr. Rowland Hill, from the Vicar of Charles, Plymouth, and from all

other

other itinerary Apostles, who fancy and who profess that they are *peculiarly inspired* for this purpose,—I say, may we not reasonably expect from them, as sound demonstration of their being so peculiarly commissioned, an exhibition of the same versatility of dialect as was conferred on the Apostles? Ought not Rowland Hill to have been of the North country at Kendal, and a Scot beyond the Tweed? Alas, alas! I have waited years and years for some proof of that inspiration which fanatics have blasphemously asserted; but, like the wicked Cardinal, if watched to their graves, they individually disappoint us, *they die and give no sign.* Whereas, the honour of God is most clearly to be impeached, if we suppose him to appoint, as ministers for a peculiar purpose, persons who are defective in qualifications; and if that purpose fail in their hands for want of supernatural assistance.

The translation of our Bible, says William Turner, *was made by men very much under the influence of system, and at a time when the critical knowledge of the original languages was comparatively in its infancy.* Both parts of this assertion may be combated. I believe that translators of the Scriptures could not have been selected from any religious party of those days, who were less likely to give to the Version they produced the peculiar tincture of their own persuasions, than the members of the Church of England. We may consider them, as persons who preserved a laudable medium between the two furious extremes of popery and Presbyterianism. They poised the balance with admirable impartiality, and truth was not sacrificed to either. The simplicity and manly fidelity of their version of the Scriptures, have rendered it an inestimable treasure to those who know how to appreciate its merits. Their ability for the task which they undertook is manifest in every part of the work; and nothing can be more rash, or more untrue, than that *the critical knowledge of the original Scriptures was then in its infancy.* The knowledge of the *Hebrew* tongue was looked upon indispensibly requisite to the clerical profession. It was no difficult matter to find *fifty-four* scholars of eminence in that language, in the kingdom of *England alone*; whereas, at present we may challenge the *three kingdoms* to produce a *fifth* part of that number, equally well qualified. If William Turner would see a specimen of the *critical knowledge* of the time, and of the profoundly learned discourses which then fell from the pulpit; let him look into *Joseph Mede*; who must have been at the University at the very period in which the present translation of the Bible was produced, though perhaps too young to be employed in it.

Our author is more fortunate in his observation, when he says that so much attention had not been paid, in those days, to *the customs and manners* of Scripture, as of late years. *These*, he adds, *have been the foundations of some of the most satisfactory explanations of Scripture passages* which had previously embarrassed us. Granted: and I will mention with peculiar respect, what William Turner, as a Dissenter, ought not to have omitted, the name of *Harmer*. But I must add, that the *Observations of Harmer* not only form a disjointed farrago of information without order or method; but have also

something

something radically defective in their very first principle. It is not safe to apply *modern custom*, on all occasions, to the illustration of *ancient writ*. It is first necessary to prove that *such custom* existed *anciently*, and has not been materially *altered*, since the period of those writings which it is so apt to elucidate. Nevertheless, that *customs and manners* have, in many instances, been transmitted to later times from the earliest antiquity, and continue still unchanged (though not immutable) I readily admit. Of the happiness of Mr. Harmer's illustrations there is seldom any question; but conviction of the legitimate origin of the fact applied, in illustration, is very frequently wanted.

Upon the whole William Turner is an advocate for learning in the priesthood: and therefore he undertakes to recommend schemes of public education, such as *have of late years been attempted. The most distinguished of these*, says he, *was the Warrington Academy, where the studies of young ministers were for many years directed* by the father of Dr. Aikin. Hence, Mr. Editor, the partiality of the Critical Reviewers to the latter. Soon after the death of Dr. Aikin's father, in 1781, this institution declined. Hence, perhaps, the Doctor's chagrin. On its failure, in 1784, some active persons in Manchester obtained the transfer of its library and a part of its *remaining* funds. What became of the *pars altera?* did Dr. Priestley take it with him to America? In Manchester a *New College* was established by these patrons of non-conformity of which they have been till now the chief supporters. At length it solicits the charitable contributions of well-disposed Christians, and William Turner is its advocate. The pulpit (*drum ecclesiastic*) is made to resound with his *tattoo*; and all able-bodied young men, of enterprizing spirit, are called upon to enlist themselves, as future Presbyterian preachers. But many a recruiting serjeant has shewn ten times his skill in *beating up*. It was well, to say that *the necessity of rigidly strict œconomy, during his academical course*, would be beneficial to the novice, by *preparing him to subsist with greater ease on the stipend of his future settlement*. But why does the author tell his audience, that young men are not to be found *whose parents are at the same time able to incur the needful expence, and willing that their sons should be educated to the profession* of non-conforming preachers? Why does he acquaint them, that there is even *an aversion* to the measure *among those in better circumstances?* Why does he proclaim, that *the pecuniary prospects of dissenting ministers are not the most inviting*; and that *it is not at all likely that a son, educated to this profession, should become the richest man of his family?* Surely this is not the way to fill the thin ranks of the dissenting squadron with new recruits. There is, however, great honesty in the confession that such are the meager wages of non-conformity. Nor is it a circumstance unworthy of our pity, that the piety of Dissenters should be so lukewarm, as to give cause to the preacher to speak of *the universally-acknowledged deficiency of the mere annual stipends* of dissenting ministers, *even in the best places. The most liberal of their incomes*, adds the author, *are not equal, in the present times, to their reputably supporting that station and character in*

society,

society, which their hearers expect. Such neglect of its ministers is disgraceful to the sect. Let it not, however, inspire those who are neglected with envy of the established church. Confined as the circumstances of dissenting ministers are, there are distresses to be heard of among the regular clergy which cannot be paralleled. Let us but cast our eyes on the account given, by the Governors of the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy, of the manner in which they distributed Mr. Stock's donation of *one hundred pounds* to *ten poor curates* in December last. It is grievous to learn that for the trifling assistance of *ten pounds*, MANY *petitions were presented, containing representations of* MUCH DISTRESS. The *ten clergymen* selected for relief, have, exclusive of their *wives*, no less than SEVENTY-SEVEN *children*; and all their incomes *united* amount to no more than TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR *pounds per annum.* When they had received Mr. Stock's donation, there were not fewer, perhaps, than NINETY-SEVEN persons, great and small, subsisting upon THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR pounds, for the present year. So that, after having *received* the benefit of that charity, *ninety-seven* persons are still compelled to live upon somewhat less than TWENTY SHILLINGS PER DAY. What heart, which is not *piece of the gother millstone*, can contemplate, without emotion, such an instance of virtuous difficulty, in times like these!

I have at length reached that concluding paragraph of William Turner's long-winded discourse, which seems to have been peculiarly touching to the Critical Reviewers; a paragraph, which drew from them *feeling* declaration, that *this institution*, which the author recommends, is *a matter of essential consequence. The new college at Manchester*, says the preacher, *is the* ONLY *English seminary in which young ministers of the above description* (that is, *Presbyterian* ministers) *are at present training up. A similar establishment, in the neighbourhood of London, which was also intended to supply the place of Warrington, has been dissolved through the failure of its funds: and a very respectable academy at Northampton, which had furnished many useful ministers, has since been discontinued.* To us, Mr. Editor, this will be no subject of regret. Nor would it have surprised us, to have found that the whole body of Dissenters had gradually dissolved, and melted into one mass with the established church. But when we find that, notwithstanding the failure of a supply of competent ministers, many of them still remain sectaries, we may justly wonder at the little propensity they shew to return to the unity of the faith. Rather than return, we find that they have put up with *the refuse of Scottish and Welsh seminaries, totally void of respectability either in the pulpit or out of it;* nay, that they have even lent their ears *to illiterate lay-preachers.* The *whole*, however, of such dissenting congregations, have not acquiesced in this unnatural transition. It has *dispersed all the more respectable members*, says William Turner, *and brought the* INTEREST *to a low ebb.* What he means by the latter expression, I know not; unless he would candidly admit, that the Dissenters had always *political views* in keeping themselves distinct from us. The effect of lay-preaching

alſo, among the Preſbyterians, we are informed by the author, is ſuch, that many *withdraw from their old aſſociates, and either mix with the eſtabliſhment, or what is* MUCH MORE TO BE LAMENTED, *decline public worſhip altogether.* Does William Turner here mean to ſay, that it is *in any degree* to be *lamented*, that ſuch perſons *return to the eſtabliſhed church?* And does the Critical Reviewer *approve* of ſuch a ſentiment? If ſuch be the charity of Preſbyterians, ſuch their opinion of our orthodoxy, ſuch their inordinate deſire to withdraw from all communion with us, I heartily thank God that he has not left us in the hands of theſe wayward *ſimplifiers.* May he defend us, Mr. Editor, from *ſimplifiers* of every denomination—whether *ſimplifiers in church*, who would *ſimplify away* our *biſhops*, our *veſtments*, our *tithes*, and our *liturgy*—the *godhead* of our divine maſter, the *inſpiration* of his diſciples, and the *creed* of their followers—or *ſimplifiers in ſtate*, who would *ſimplify into annihilation* our *king*, our *ariſtocracy*, our *liberty*, our *commerce*, our *property*, and our *laws.* Of the miſerable effects of *ſimplification* of the latter kind, we have had ſufficient experience in the reiterated convulſions of a nation too near to us: the deplorable conſequences of the former kind of *ſimplification*, we have felt in our own perſons. Let us bolt our doors to this treacherous and deluſive gueſt, and admit it in no ſhape whatever. If Mr. Frend wiſhes to *ſimplify* our liturgy, as he has already *ſimpliſied* the ſcience of Algebra, reforming what he has fondly ſtiled the *jargon* of Sir Iſaac Newton, and ſubſtituting a *new jargon* of his own, leſs *known* and therefore leſs *intelligible*—let him be informed, that the church of England has long ago declared her opinion of thoſe *who would have all things deviſed anew*, and it is this: *in ſuch a caſe they ought rather to have reverence unto antiquity, if they will declare themſelves to be more ſtudious of unity and concord, than of innovations, and new-fangleneſs, which is always to be eſchewed.* A ſtronger proof of her ſound ſenſe ſhe could not have produced. As ſhe has repeated the ſentiment at another place, I cannot forbear to notice it. Some, ſays ſhe, *are addicted to their old cuſtoms: and again, on the other ſide, ſome be ſo new-fangled, that they would innovate all things, and ſo deſpiſe the old, that nothing can like them, but that is new: it was thought expedient, not ſo much to have reſpect how to pleaſe and ſatisfy either of theſe parties, as how to pleaſe God and profit them both.* Could an oracle have ſpoken more judiciouſly? Hear it, Mr. Frend; hear it, ye *ſimplifiers* of church and ſtate. Again. *We know it impoſſible (in ſuch variety of apprehenſions, humours, and intereſts, as are in the world) to pleaſe all: nor can expect, that men of factious, peeviſh, and perverſe ſpirits, ſhould be ſatisfied with any thing that can be done, in this kind, by any other than themſelves.* Was the truth ever ſpoken in terms more plain and forcible? Mr. Editor. The impugners of our Liturgy, *peremptorily as they call for change* in the perſon of the *Critical Reviewers*, would certainly be ſatisfied with no ſacrifice whatever. Nothing leſs than total abolition, and leave to new model (that is *to ſimplify*) us after their own faſhion, would entirely content them. But of their *ſimplifying ſchemes*, let us acquaint them, in the firm

and

and manly language of our church, that we have no need; *for we are fully perſuaded in our judgments (and we here profeſs it to the world) that the book of common-prayer doth not contain in it any thing contrary to the word of God, or to ſound doctrine; or which a godly man may not, with a good conſcience, uſe and ſubmit unto; or which is not fairly defenſible againſt any that ſhall oppoſe the ſame, if it ſhall be allowed ſuch juſt and favourable conſtruction, as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human writings.*

ACADEMICUS.

A Vindication of the "Iter Britanniarum, or that Part of the Itinerary of Antoninus which relates to Britain, with a New Comment. By the Rev. Thomas Reynolds," being a Review of the Review of that Article inſerted in the British Critic of December and January laſt, in a Letter to the Editor of the Anti-Jacobin Review.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

I AM a conſtant reader and a hearty friend of your publication the Anti-Jacobin Review. I have no doubt it has produced, and will continue to produce, a very ſubſtantial benefit to this country by its oppoſition to thoſe deteſtable principles, which have been ſo long ſpreading themſelves in this iſland, without contradiction or controul, to the great regret of every ſober and honeſt mind. But I am particularly pleaſed with your Reviews of the Reviewers. This is an article which has been long wanted on two accounts; firſt and principally to combat thoſe dangerous doctrines, which have been ſo freely and continually promulgated, ſafe from contradiction or remark, by ſome writers of this deſcription; and ſecondly to afford injured authors a place to vindicate themſelves againſt unfair criticiſms upon their works, which often appear to have been dictated by the private prejudices and favourite opinions of the Reviewers, rather than by that candour and impartiality which ought to direct their labours. Such an article, conducted with temper and liberality, muſt be conſidered as a very important acquiſition by every reader, who can eſtimate its true value.

It has been my misfortune (an author may certainly call it ſo, when it is conſidered what an effect ſuch a circumſtance may have with regard to the circulation of his work) to have fallen under the very warm cenſure of one of the Reviews: and of a Review, which I do not complain of without reluctance, becauſe its general principles have my unqualified approbation. But in this Review I have not only been cenſured, I have been loaded with obloquy and perſonal abuſe, a ſpecies of rhetoric inexcuſeable in any writer, and much more ſo in one, who takes upon himſelf to ſit in judgement upon the merits of others. My Reviewer, however, has indulged himſelf ſo profuſely in this way, that ſcarce a ſingle paragraph, in his long criticiſm, is without ſome perſonal reflection. By this method he probably

probably hoped to give himself more consequence, and add that authority to his decisions, which he was aware his arguments were not likely to produce. If he has succeeded, it must have arisen from the obscurity and difficulty of the subject; in which few are so conversant as to be able to detect the fallacy of those arguments, which are proposed with so bold an appearance of superiority and contempt.

To shew you, that I do not complain without cause of the want of good manners in my Reviewer, I will just give you my character, as it might be extracted from this criticism by some reader of it, who, no doubt, would feel a very ardent wish to be possessed of a work composed by so accomplished an author. "Mr. Reynolds (this ill-fated name is repeated forty times in the two articles) writes against authority and against evidence; contradicts the strongest evidences without discussing them; enslaved to an hypothesis, puts a bandage over his own eyes; acts (in the middle of his work) with an ingenuousness which he had never shewn before; takes refuge behind every bush, and alledges uncertainties, where none appear, to evade reasonings which he could not resist; urges arguments only to puzzle; shuffles with opinions; erects a system, not only false, but the fabrick of his own fancy only; asserts what is known to be historically false; uses his powers of perversion on every occasion; throws down opinions, on which he has rested, and thinks and acts the very reverse; adopts a slight of hand, as disgraceful to the probity, as to the judgement of any writer, with the same injudiciousness of mind; is actuated by a spirit of cavilling in all his reasonings; is a mutable critic; ignorant, blind, presumptuous, of defective judgement; goes beyond the extremity of wildness, and bursts beyond all bounds of sense." It has been hinted to me by a person, whose urbanity of manners forms a strong contrast to the incivility of his colleague, that all this cannot be deemed personal, because the writer could have no acquaintance with me.* But surely personality in abuse does not require a personal acquaintance. Dr. Hey did not think so, when he proposed his canon of controversy against using personal reflections. He explains his meaning by—"what if A. were a dull man, B. a pert forward man, C. a sot, D. a hypocrite," &c. only one of which (if any) could require a personal acquaintance.

The Review commences with a short but very injurious preface. Its tendency is to repress public curiosity and consequently prevent the sale of the work. It remarks, "This is a new attempt at a

* Happening to know the reviewer of this article in the British Critic, we can assure Mr. Reynolds, that he is incapable of suffering his critical decisions to be influenced by any motives of personal dislike; and that, in the present instance, his mind could not possibly harbour any such motives. The insertion of these remarks of Mr. R. reflecting so strongly on a writer, whom we have every reason to admire and esteem, will, we trust, be received as a proof of our impartiality and justice. EDITOR.

work

work which has been repeatedly undertaken before, and executed in general with satisfaction to the public." A writer, who enters upon any difficult research, will have credit for a diligent inquiry after all those who have gone before him in the same path. I cannot accuse myself of negligence in this particular; but I have not been able to discover one commentator upon the British part of the itinerary, who in the least deserves the character here given. Burton was the only author I could ever hear of, who published a finished work similar to mine. But he lived too near the revival of this kind of learning to give much satisfaction to the present times. Talbot's and Gale's Comments are both imperfect attempts. And Horsley has only added a short essay. Many writers, indeed, have touched incidentally upon Antoninus, (as I have shewn in my preface,) and attempted to fix the situation of some of his towns in Britain. But even in this respect no single author has met with much success. Camden ranks deservedly the first of this class, and yet I have not found reason to agree with him in the situation of more than fifty towns, out of the one hundred and thirty, which the Itinerary mentions in this island. I must therefore contend, that the Reviewer had no foundation whatever for saying, that similar works had been "repeatedly undertaken and executed to the satisfaction of the public," and that he must be well aware, that my work was entirely different from any of my predecessors upon many very essential points, which had never been discussed with any attention, but which were absolutely necessary to be inquired into to establish the value and importance of this curious remnant of Roman antiquity.

The greater part of the criticism is occupied in combating two particular opinions, as if the whole structure of the work depended upon the truth of them. These seem to have excited so warm a resentment, by contradicting some favourite notions, and long established prejudices of the critic, that he was determined to condemn the work altogether, and abuse the author with every opprobrious epithet which his ingenuity could enable him to introduce. A more illiberal article does not often disgrace the pages of any of the Reviews, and in the British Critic I never remember before to have seen any thing so unworthy the well known characters of its Editors.

After a very long examination and very intimate acquaintance with the subject of my inquiry, I have observed that where the towns lie at a greater distance than the numbers will reach, some of our "first writers have supposed a town omitted, and ventured to supply the vacancy, but that the correction of the numbers is much more natural, because we find many instances, where they are certainly faulty; but I have not met with any thing, that creates even a suspicion, that there is a single town less in the Itinerary now than there was at first." And again I have supposed "Hadrian's Wall the boundary of the Empire, when the Itinerary was written." These two positions the Reviewer has selected as particularly objectionable. "The critical idea of the nearly perfect

state

state of the Itinerary in general, and—the historical notion of the Romans being (at the time it was written) in possession only of the south of the wall of Hadrian are a notion, and an idea taken up against authority and against evidence, and have led the author wildly astray:" and the far larger part of the criticism is spent in contradicting the latter of these opinions, to this therefore I shall confine my remarks, that I may not tresspass too much upon your pages.

"That the country between the walls of Hadrian and Antoninus was not given up," it is observed, "nor meant to be given up by Hadrian, is demonstrable from several points." And these demonstrations are declared to be, certain antiquities, found at Riechester and Risingham beyond the wall; and the evidence of Mr. Whitaker.

"At Riechester, in Northumberland, some miles to the north of Hadrian's Wall, has been found an inscription on a stone, that was assuredly a part of a temple there, for the safety of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. This temple therefore was erected in the reign of one of the Antonine's, when the Romans were in full possession of parts north of the wall, built by Hadrian, and in such secure possession, as to be building a temple. Several coins of the same Emperor have been found at the same place. An inscription was also found at Risingham to one of the Antonines. These sufficiently prove, that this region, north of the wall, was not given up in the reign of Hadrian, and that his immediate successors, the Antonines, still retained garrisons in it. What then can be said for a writer, who, with these evidences all before his eyes, could presume to contradict, yet not venture to discuss, them? Nothing can be said, but that, enslaved to an hypothesis, he put a bandage over his own eyes?"

The triumphant shout in the conclusion would have been certainly better omitted, because it can be proved very easily, that these evidences have really not been contradicted. It is stated by me, that "Hadrian's wall continued most probably the bounds of the Empire in this island, during the remainder of his reign, about the term of eighteen years." The very next line adds, "under Antoninus Pius, another wall was built. Camden has settled the place between the Friths of Edinburgh and Dunbarton, where its claim has remained undisputed, nor can I see any reason to dispute it." The plenary possession of Antoninus Pius being thus fully admitted in the country, even to the second wall, how can it be said with any truth, that I have contradicted these evidences? I have really allowed more than they prove. For the inscription, found at Risingham, shews no more, if it does so much, than that Antoninus the philosopher, the successor of Pius, and whose reign did not commence before, at least twenty years after the death of Hadrian, occupied that station. And the inscription at Riechester, Horsley clearly makes out, must have belonged to Caracalla, between whom and Hadrian, was an interval of seventy years. Horsley modestly infers from these premises, that "about that time, the Romans possessed these stations." But the Reviewer carries the inference even to the proving the constant and uninterrupted possession of

Hadrian in these parts, to which point they certainly have not the smallest reference. If the possession of countries by Hadrian's successors is allowed to be direct evidence, that Hadrian never relinquished them, history has no doubt traduced the character of this Emperor, in attributing to him the first retrograde movement of the god Terminus. He could not make the Euphrates the bounds of the Empire in the east; for it is certain the Romans had possession of Mesopotamia, and other countries beyond that river to a very late period of the Empire. But if it is granted, that it was Hadrian's peculiar humour and polity to abandon countries, and set bounds to the Empire, why might he not indulge it in one country as well as another? The building of his wall appears to be a positive proof, that he did so in Britain. And the Itinerary of Antoninus adds great weight to this supposition by giving the name of Limes to this vallum, which word cannot well be interpreted to mean any thing but the boundary of the Empire. If the inscriptions and coins abovementioned had absolutely belonged to Hadrian, they could not have been considered as a demonstration of the falsehood of this opinion, because it is more than probable that Hadrian's forces were in possession of the country to some distance beyond his wall, sufficient time to erect inscriptions and leave coins, before the wall was finished, and established as the boundary of the Empire.

But these arguments, I presume, did not appear to the Reviewer himself perfectly conclusive; he therefore proceeds to make the matter clearer by a quotation from a work, which he observes, "seems to be as familiar to me as Horsley's, the arguments of which I have chose to contradict, though not ventured to discuss." This work is Mr. Whitaker's History of Manchester, which to my great astonishment he calls a juvenile work. This is an epithet not calculated to add weight to its authority; yet, at the same time, he rather perversely blames me for nor paying implicit obedience to all its decisions. The evidence of a modern, nay of an author, actually living in the last year of the eighteenth century, adduced in proof of an historical fact, which occurred in the early part of the second century, must be allowed to be not a very common, nor yet convincing mode of arguing. And why introduce Mr. Whitaker in a manner so disagreeable for a purpose so unusual? He must have drawn his information from sources open to other writers. It would have been much more satisfactory to have produced his authorities, instead of bringing him forward so invidiously as a testimony, which no one ought to dare to contradict. I should think very unworthily of this learned author, if I could believe him gratified by such an officious exaltation.

The only propositions in the quotation from the History of Manchester, immediately connected with the matter in dispute, are the two, in which it is asserted, that "Hadrian by erecting his wall did not mean to cede Valentia to the enemy;" and "Valentia was constantly in the power of the Romans." But as these are positions, which after a careful examination, did not appear to me supported by

by the authorities, I considered myself at liberty to pass them unnoticed. The latter circumstance, indeed, is not very easily reconciled with the relation given, in the same quotation, a few lines before, of " the Caledonians, in the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian overrunning not only Valentia without the wall, but Maxima within." This surely admits a temporary suspension of the Roman power in these parts, and I contend for nothing more. If Mr. W. means that Hadrian did not cede Valentia by treaty to the Caledonians, I entirely agree with him. I understand, that Iovian was the first Emperor, who brought that disgrace upon the Empire. But I am well assured, that no antient author or other evidence can be produced to contradict the idea, excited by Antoninés Itinerary, that Hadrian, when he built his wall, made that wall the limes, or boundary of the Roman Empire in this island, and that he gave up to the natives the possession of the country, which lay beyond it. Pursuing the same argument, though not openly and directly, that " the Romans had possessions beyond the wall, when the Itinerary was written," the Reviewer proceeds to criticise the situation of two towns, one of which has been supposed by several antiquaries certainly to lie beyond the wall, and the other has been allotted a situation upon the wall, which countenances the supposition, that two others also lay beyond it. To these two towns, which are Bremenium and Luguvallium, I have thought myself authorised by the Itinerary to assign situations, different from those which have been generally given to them by all former writers upon this subject. To these alterations this critic objects with great warmth; but I cannot say his arguments have in the least tended to change my opinion.

" The first iter, he observes, is made to commence its career, a limite, id est, a Vallo and a Bremenio together." But this ought not so much to be objected to me as to my author. Antoninus made the iter to commence in this manner. That Limes, and Vallum are intended to express the same thing must be allowed, since the latter is only added in explanation of the former, a Limite, id est a Vallo. And the repetition of the preposition *a*, before Bremenio, so completely proves the connection of the town with a Limite and a Vallo, the place of which a Bremenio supplies, that it seems very strange, that any one could ever suppose them not to mean one and the same spot. If Bremenio had appeared without the preposition, there might have been more reason to suppose a possible omission of some towns before it, but in the present state of the terms, no doubt of the kind can be entertained. And this is farther confirmed by the commencement of the second iter, where we again read a Vallo in the title, and a Blato Bulgio as the first town. Blatum Bulgium, Camden has supposed to mean Bulness, and the situation agrees so exactly with the description of the Itinerary, that there seems no reason to dispute his determination. Horsley, indeed, has ventured to propose the situations of both Blatum Bulgium, and Castra Exploratorum beyond the wall, but it is plain he has not done so without some hesitation. His

interpretation of the phrase, a Vallo, is far from giving its natural and direct meaning. Nor can I perceive how the wall could be made the commencement of an iter in any other way than we here see it. Every iter is a journey from one principal town to another. When, therefore, an iter is said to begin from a wall, it must be expected, that the author means from some town, adjoining the wall. And this is found to be the case in two very positive instances, and whoever seeks these towns in any other place, not connected with the wall, cannot take the authority of Antoninus for his guide. The first iter begins a Vallo; the first town is Bremenium, and in the place expected, we find Newcastle-upon-Tyne, a town of great consequence in these parts, and the Roman antiquity of which has never been disputed. It is agreed, I believe, by all our antiquaries, that Corstipitum, the second town in the Itinerary, stood near the present town of Corbridge, about three miles from Hadrian's wall, and within it. Now no other wall but Hadrian's could be mentioned by Antoninus, if the age assigned to this work in my introduction is admitted. If the Itinerary was finished before the death of Hadrian, it cannot be supposed to speak of the wall of Antoninus, which could not be erected till some years after that event. Bremenium then must be expected to be found in contact with the wall of Hadrian, at about twenty miles distance from Corbridge. Towards the west there is no town, or ruins of a town, of any consequence at that distance whereas on the eastern side, there lies a town, which in every respect precisely answers the description of the Itinerary. The second iter also begins a Vallo, and a town called Bulness is found exactly in the situation described by Antoninus for his Bulgium. The communication with the second town, in both the first iters, is by a road, which lies by, or near, the wall, or parallel with it. It cannot appear more extraordinary, that the first should begin at Newcastle, and pass along the wall road to Corbridge, than that the second should commence at Bulness, and pass along the same road to Carlisle. If the abrupt turn in the road in the first iter should seem to any one an objection to the claim of Newcastle, the similar turn in the second iter may reasonably be admitted as an answer to the objection.

"But," says the critic, "Bremenium has been fixed at Riechester, and there fixed upon the best of authorities, a Roman inscription, bearing the very appellation of Bremenium; and it is here attempted to be transferred only in subserviency to a hastily adopted hypothesis." In removing Bremenium from Riechester, I am also described "as anxiously struggling against overpowering evidence, which I am unable to throw off." To these propositions I am by no means inclined to subscribe. I am not convinced, that it can be said with truth, that "Bremenium has been fixed at Riechester." Camden is the first, who conjectures that it might be there. Horsley acquiesces in his determination. But neither of these authors has admitted this opinion without difficulty, as I shall have occasion to shew. Gale and Gibson have thought differently. "It is gratis dictum,

dictum, the latter observes, (and ought to be well proved, before the weight of the objection can be taken off) that the words, id est a Vallo, are an interpretation of the transcriber." He opposes these words plainly to the authority of the inscription. Mr. Whitaker and myself, as living authors, have added a vote to each party. Votes then are equal, and the thing cannot properly be said to be decided, as far as such evidence reaches.

The authority of the inscription, I have so fully discussed in the work, that I have nothing material to add upon the subject. The Reviewer's general position that " when a town is mentioned upon an inscription, the natural conclusion is, that the name belongs to the place, where the inscription is found," will not, I am certain, be adopted by any one, who will take the trouble to consider the point in a full and careful manner. It may sometimes be the fact, but by no means generally true. The instance in the inscription at Bath, the critic is obliged to allow to be a positive exception. And if one exception is found, why may not another be supposed? He calls Glev. the well known appellation of another town, and therefore it cannot be applied to the town, where found. Why then confine Bremen to the place where found, when an equally good reason can be given why it cannot be so applied? And this is, that the town, mentioned in it, is described by a very antient author as lying upon a certain wall, which was the boundary of the Roman Empire in Britain; whereas Riechester stands near twenty miles beyond that wall.

In examining this inscription I have said, that the word BREMEN in it is plainly a contraction, and much more likely to be an adjective to EXPLOR, Exploratorum Bremeniensium, than the name of the town Bremeni. My Reviewer tells his readers that " I did not advert at the moment, that the name is no contraction, but at full length on the altar itself BREMENI, and only obscured by the last letter being complicated in the mode very familiar in inscriptions, with the letter immediately preceding." I shall willingly allow it possible, that this complication may be, as it is here stated. But Bremeni is not the second case of Bremenium, and so this writer knew full well, for he is under a necessity of reading Bremenum, contrary to all the copies of the Itinerary, to support his assertion. A much more innocent alteration of the text, by Surita, is pronounced by this critic, " a slight of hand disgraceful to his probity," and I am accused, though falsely, of adopting this slight of hand with the same injudiciousness of " mind." I am however entirely disposed to admit the reading to be Bremeni, since it adds one more letter, and makes the evidence stronger, that the word was intended for Bremeniensium, the reading proposed by me.

As to my " anxiously struggling against overpowering evidence in removing Bremenium from Riechester," it will perhaps be found, that this is more strictly applicable to those antiquaries, who placed it there than to me, whose only wish it is to give it its true place, wherever that may be found. For what says Camden? After copying the inscription, he observes in his modest and very pleasant manner,

manner, "May we not hence guess, that here was Bremenium?" But his chief guide in these matters, the old Itinerary of Antoninus, presented "an overpowering evidence to be struggled with." This author describes the iter, of which Bremenium is the first town, as beginning from a certain wall, which was then the boundary of the Roman Empire in these parts, a Limite, id est, a Vallo. He was therefore well aware, that the admission of Bremenium in any situation, not connected with the wall, must be a contradiction to this ancient writer. And how is this difficulty surmounted by him? Is it not by supposing "the words, id est a Vallo, a gloss of some transcriber, since Bremenium lies fourteen miles beyond it?" Can any unprejudiced reader believe, that this great man was not much pressed, before he could prevail upon himself to resort to so desperate an expedient to remove evidence, which he could not contradicted? Nor did Horsley admit this situation of Bremenium without difficulty. He saw no reason to think a Vallo an interpolation. He observes "a Limite, and a Vallo, seem to be equivalent one to the other, by the explanatory insertion of, id est, and, I believe, signify no more than the most advanced station on the north side of the wall, but not very distant from it. In the expression a Vallo, the word Vallum seems to denote the term, from which the iter was directed, but with some latitude so as not strictly to signify the Vallum itself, but any place within a moderate distance from it." But why all this struggle to give such a forced and unnatural interpretation of the phrase a Vallo? Is it not a proof that whatever scheme will shew a Vallo, a Limite, and a Bremenio to signify the same spot, must be the most satisfactory solution of these difficulties. I shall only add, that the situation I have proposed for Bremenium is not opposed either by Ptolemy, Ravennas, or any antient writer. The inscription is the only argument in any way doubtful, and that, I am still persuaded, is more in favour of Newcastle, than of Riechester, where it was found. I have carefully re-examined the inscriptions, which contain the names Bracchio and Habitanci, and find no ground from the remarks of the Reviewer to change my opinion of them.

From Bremenium, and the inscriptions, the criticism passes to the second iter. This begins like the first a Vallo, and Camden has assigned a probable situation for the first town. Setting out from this town, the numbers of Antoninus appeared to me to ascertain the position of the five succeeding towns. But a very strong objection presented itself in the generally received opinion, that Carlisle occupies the site of the Roman Luguvallium, the third town in the Itinerary, and not that of Castra Exploratorum, the second, which my scheme would place there. It became then necessary to consider the proofs, which have given rise to the idea, that Carlisle was the remains of Luguvallium, rather than of Castra Exploratorum. The result was the discovery, that there was no positive, or even probable, proof of this fact, and I accordingly found myself at liberty to propose that arrangement of the towns, which the Itinerary points out.

Camden,

Camden, speaking of Carlisle, tells us, "the Romans and Britons called this city Lugubakum, the Saxons, as Bede witnesses, Luel." For an assertion so positive, I could not but persuade myself, that this learned man must have had an adequate authority. And this he appeared to me to derive from Bede, whose works I was not then able to obtain a sight of. I was therefore obliged to reason from the supposition, that this author, writing in a very dark age, might possibly be mistaken with respect to the Roman name of this town. But I have now had the works of this venerable Monk sometime in my possession, and had the satisfaction to find, that he has given no ground whatever for this opinion. Bede's Luguballia, called by the Saxons corruptly Luel, is not more certain as to its situation than Antonine's. He mentions two visits paid by St. Cuthbert to Luguballia. But he has not laid down the smallest trace of the journey of this prelate, to guide us to it. He does not most remotely hint at any connection it had with any other town. He has, indeed, related a fact, which gives reason to look for this old city, at no great distance from Derwentwater Lake, which lies close to Keswich, in Cumberland. He informs us, that "Cuthbert had a friend a hermit, who lived upon an island in this lake, who, when he heard of Cuthbert's Anival, at Luguballia, came to pay his respects to him." This relation intimates no great distance between these places, and is very favourable to the situation I have assigned to Luguvallium on the authority of Antonine. The map of the Itinerary will shew, that a secluded hermit, at Galava, would hear of any circumstance at my Luguvallium with much more probability, than at Carlisle, where it has been usually placed. I do not, however, lay any great stress upon this argument though it is more than equal to some, which my Reviewer has dignified with the title of demonstrations. But in giving this new place to Luguvallium, this critic brings a very formidable charge against me; even that "I act in contradiction to myself;" that "I throw down opinions, on which I had rested before, and think and act the very reverse;" nay, that "I am still more unfortunate. An iter even of Antonines comes up to stop the march of this moving city, and to call out new powers of perversion in the author of its march. The fifth iter interposes to place Luguvallium expressly ad Vallum, and we who have seen the stress laid upon the same kind of expression before, cannot now but anticipate in thought, how readily, at the sight, the author will wheel about with his city, and how hastily he will retreat with it into its old lines again. But we have judged too hastily of Mr. Reynolds. He scorns to yield and disdains to fly. He is a true soldier of Muscovy."

In this passage the Reviewer acknowledges, that he has judged too hastily of me. In my opinion his whole criticism wears the same character. He must have read my work very superficially to suppose, that I did not attend to the ad Vallum of the fifth iter in settling the new situation of Luguvallium in the second. I have, indeed, laid some stress upon the phrase a Vallo, but I cannot perceive

ceive in what manner I contradict myself, when I do not admit ad Vallum to have precisely the same signification. Ainsworth shews in his Dictionary, that the preposition ad is used by authors in twenty-two senses. The seventh of these is—"near to"—which I have admitted as the meaning, which Antoninus must have intended in this place, as he had before settled the site of Luguvallium at the distance of twelve miles from the wall. We have here certainly no obligation, as in the phrase a Vallo, to suppose the town attached to the wall. Nor is this the situation of Carlisle. That town, according to Paterson's British Itinerary, lies at least half a mile from the wall. Surita, the Spanish Commentator, who had not the same prejudices with the Reviewer to contend with, did not think a distance of twenty-five miles incompatible with this phrase. And I have ventured to urge, that "in a journey of almost five hundred miles, a town may be literally said to be near to any object, though it should prove to be twelve miles from it, and that a person in London would speak with sufficient accuracy in making the situation of a town in the North of England, if he said it was near Newcastle, or Carlisle, though it should be even farther than old Penrith, (more commonly called Plumpton Wall) is from the Picts Wall." This our critic, in great wrath, calls "an idle and irrelevant argument, because the Itinerary is a regular mensuration of distances, "and in such a mensuration, a journey of five hundred or even five thousand miles, could make no excuse for placing a town twelve miles from its true position. What comparison can there be between such a mensuration, and the gossiping tales of a Londoner about a town near Newcastle or Carlisle?" Here rage rather got the better of reason, or it would have been perceived, that the words ad Vallum can make no difference in the mensuration. They can neither increase nor diminish the distance of the town. They are merely descriptive of the situation of it. And the propriety of the expression must depend upon the intervening space. A place could not be properly described in this manner in a journey of thirty or forty miles. In a distance of five hundred miles, a distance of twelve miles in description, though not in mensuration, becomes a small space. Surita's idea, considering that he lived in Spain, is perfectly natural. And Antoninus, writing at Rome, might have described Eboracum as near the boundary of the Empire without any absurdity, though it stands a hundred miles from that point. The propriety of this way of speaking must depend upon the distance of the speaker, and has no reference to the mensuration in any way whatever.

I could add many more observations upon this singular piece of criticism, but I am afraid I have already exceeded your limits. I have endeavoured to keep to consequentials, and of these I have passed over several, not for want of ability to answer them, but for want of room. I cannot, indeed, perceive, that there is one solid argument urged against me in the whole Review. It is strong only in abuse, and in language equally indecorous for a gentleman, and a scholar, to give, or to receive.

If the lateness of this communication for your work should be thought to require an apology, mine is the same with Mr. Jones's friend, A. I. N. I doubted whether you would give it admission. The twenty-seventh Article in the September Anti-Jacobin, has removed that doubt, and I now finish a letter which I actually began in the month of February, and had long laid aside, but now hope to see in your work as soon as convenient.

Yours, &c.
THOMAS REYNOLDS.

MISCELLANIES.

SELECT BIOGRAPHY.

The MARQUIS DE BOUILLE.

THE MARQUIS DE BOUILLE was born at the Chatean du Cluzel, the ſeat of his anceſtors, in 1740. His mother having died in giving him birth, and his father having ſurvived her loſs but a few years, he was left to the care of his paternal uncle, at that time Dean to the Counts of Lyon, and firſt Almoner to the King, and afterwards Biſhop of Autun; who ſent him to the college of LOUIS THE GREAT which was under the direction of the Jeſuits, and, when he was ſixteen, bought for him a troop of dragoons, in the regiment de la Ferronays. In 1758 he went with his regiment to join the Count de Clermont, who had been juſt defeated at Crevelt. M. de Bouillé diſtinguiſhed himſelf, during that war, on every occaſion which the active ſervice of the light troops afforded him, and, particularly, at the affair of *Grumberg*, in March 1761, where, at the head of the van-guard of dragoons, which he commanded, he pierced a ſtrong column of the enemy, compoſed of ſeveral thouſand men, under the command of the hereditary Prince (now Duke) of Brunſwick; took ſeveral pieces of cannon and ſeveral colours, and paved the way for the deciſive advantage obtained, on that day, by the French over the Allies. He received, as a reward for his ſervices, the brevet-rank of Colonel; had the honour of preſenting the captured colours to the King; and was promiſed the firſt regiment that ſhould fall vacant. Accordingly, at the concluſion of the campaign, he was appointed Colonel of the regiment of M. deVaſtan, who had been killed at the ſiege of Brunſwick. This regiment (of infantry) bore his name till the end of the war, when it took the name of—Vexin.

In 1768, when he was only twenty-eight years of age, he was made Governor of Guadeloupe, and by his government of that Colony, he ſo far acquired the eſteem and confidence of *M. de Emery*, Governor-general of the French iſlands, an officer diſtinguiſhed for his talents and his knowledge, that when he was, ſome time after, appointed to the government of St. Domingo, he repreſented M. de Bouillé to the Miniſters as the man who was beſt qualified to ſucceed him, in the event of his death. In fact, that officer dying in 1777, M. de Bouillé was appointed to ſucceed him; but ſome Court intrigue having induced the Miniſter to adopt a different arrangement, and the war with Eng-

land being on the point of breaking out, he was nominated Governor of Martinique and St. Lucie, with power to take the command of all the windward iſles as ſoon as hoſtilities ſhould commence. War was declared in 1778, and M. de Bouillé ſignalized its opening by the capture of Dominique, in September in the ſame year. In 1781 he took Tobago and St. Euſtatius. The boldneſs and ſucceſs of this laſt expedition were not more remarkable than the diſintereſted conduct of M. de Bouillé, in reſtoring to the Dutch merchants and planters, 250,000, which Admiral Rodney had ſeized when he reduced the iſland in the preceding year. In 1778 he took St. Chriſtopher, and the adjacent iſles of Nevis and Montſerrat, and was, in conſequence, promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-general. In April 1782, he went to form a junction with the Spaniſh General, Don Galvez, in order to attack Jamaica with 25,000 men, when the defeat of M. de Graſſe by Admiral Rodney, totally diſconcerted the plan, and gave a change to the war which had hitherto been ſo fortunate for France. During its continuance, M. de Bouillé did not diſtinguiſh himſelf leſs by his generoſity, and magnanimous conduct to the enemy, than by his military atchievements; and he was not leſs uſeful to the colonies which he governed, by the tranquillity which they enjoyed through his vigilance and the influence of his name, than by the labours of his adminiſtration.

During the war, an Engliſh frigate was ſhipwrecked off Martinique, and the officers and crew having ſaved themſelves in the boats and landed on the iſland, went to ſurrender themſelves to the Governor. But M. de Bouillé, having informed himſelf of the means by which they came into his power, generouſly obſerved to the Captain, that if it had been his fate to have taken them in battle he ſhould have received them as priſoners, but he ſcorned to profit by the misfortunes of an enemy, and, as the caſe was, he begged to have the honour of receiving them as gueſts. He accordingly treated them with the greateſt hoſpitality; and, by the firſt opportunity, ſent them back to an Engliſh iſland! What a contraſt does the conduct of this loyal Frenchman afford to that of French Republicans, on ſimilar occaſions!

On the concluſion of peace, in 1783, he returned to France and was included, by the King, in the firſt liſt of promotions, of the Knights of the Holy Ghoſt. His Majeſty wiſhing, at the ſame time, to confer a more ſolid mark of his favour on M. de Bouillé, ordered the Miniſter of the Marine Department, to enquire the amount of the debts which he knew M. de Bouillé had contracted, inſtead of enriching himſelf, as he might have done, during the war. Theſe debts amounted to more than 20,000l. ſterling; and the King offered to pay them, but M. de Bouillé, with his uſual diſintereſtedneſs, rejected the offer, refuſing to become burdenſome to the State which he had the good fortune to ſerve.

In 1784, he came to England where he was received with that attention and reſpect which, from his virtues and his conduct, he ſo richly deſerved; and he carried away with him the moſt honourable marks of the eſteem of all who had an opportunity of witneſſing thoſe virtues and that conduct during the war.

He

He was a Member of both the aſſemblies of Notables which Louis the Sixteenth convened in 1786 and 1788; and in the laſt, he declared, with energy, his inviolable attachment to the old principles of the Monarchy which the Court itſelf betrayed a diſpoſition to abandon. In 1787 he was appointed Commandant en Second of the Province of the Three Biſhopricks, and when the Revolution began, in 1789, he retained his command, contrary to the general example of the times. In 1790 he was entruſted with the command, not only of that province, but of Alſace, Lorraine, and Franche-Comtè; and he was afterwards appointed to the command of one of the four diviſions of the newly-conſtituted French army. The Memoirs which he publiſhed in London, in 1797, and which, as Mr. MALLET DU PAN ſo juſtly obſerved, "*are written with the veracity of a man of honour, and the frankneſs of a ſoldier,*" give a faithful account of his conduct and his efforts in circumſtances of extreme difficulty. It will be ſufficient to remark, that, in the midſt of general diſorder and confuſion, he maintained order and diſcipline around him, and always extorted reſpect from the troops under his command. He ſtifled in its birth, by the adoption of deciſive meaſures, the inſurrection of the garriſon and inhabitants of Nancy, on the 31ſt of Auguſt, 1790, and, by the vigour which he diſplayed on the occaſion, he diſconcerted, or, at leaſt, retarded, the plans of the Jacobins. In ſhort, *calm and moderate amidſt the violence of contending parties, by all of whom he was equally courted, and only liſtening to the voice, and only attending to the ſervice of his unfortunate Sovereign*, he maintained himſelf, by his own perſonal exertions, in a difficult and dangerous poſt, in order to wait for the moment when he might be of uſe to his maſter. *He adopted the means propoſed by the King for his eſcape in* 1790; and, in 1791, he had prepared a retreat for him in the diſtrict which he commanded. But here fortune forſook him, and made him for ever regret that ſhe had not reſerved for this event all the favour which ſhe had laviſhed on him before. From that time M. de Bouillé partook of the exile and misfortunes of the other Royaliſts; and, without making any proviſion for the future, faithful to thoſe diſintereſted and honourable principles which had ever actuated his conduct through life, he paid to the brothers of the King the money which he had received from his Majeſty, to make the neceſſary preparations for his eſcape, to the amount of 32,000l. ſterling.

The conſideration in which his ſervices and his attachment to his Sovereign were holden was not confined to his native country. It procured him ſome brilliant offers both from the Empreſs of Ruſſia and the King of Pruſſia; but being, at the ſame time, ſolicited by Guſtavus the Third, King of Sweden, the antient ally of France, who projected a deſcent in Normandy of which M. de Bouillé was promiſed the command, the deſire of ſtill ſerving, and, if poſſible, of ſaving Louis the Sixteenth, made him reject every other propoſition in order to attach himſelf to that unfortunate Prince.

In 1791 he attended the conferences at Pilnitz and followed the Emperor Leopold, at his own deſire, to Prague, to concert with the Auſtrian and Pruſſian Generals, the meaſures to be taken relative to

the ſtate of France. In 1792 the King of Pruſſia, being on the eve of declaring war againſt France, ſent for him to Magdebourg to conſult with him on the operations of the campaign.

He accompanied the Duke of York, in the campaign of 1793, during which he was ſolicited by the Vendeans, and urged by the French Princes, to place himſelf at their head; but conceiving that the allied powers had no intention of affording effectual aſſiſtance to his loyal countrymen, and deſpairing of ſucceſs, without ſuch aſſiſtance, he declined the invitation. He came over to England ſoon after, when he was conſulted by government, on the reduction of the French iſlands, and being employed by them, on different occaſions, he received marks of their confidence, liberality, and eſteem.

The laſt years of his life were paſt in ſufferings, in which he diſplayed as much courage as he had formerly manifeſted amidſt the dangers of war, which he had ſo often braved. He died, on the 14th of November, 1800; with a firmneſs conformable to his actions, and with that tranquillity which reſults from the conſciouſneſs of a well-ſpent life. The modeſty which marked his character was evident in his regulations reſpecting his funeral; and in his laſt exhortations to his children to practice virtue more than he had practiced it himſelf.

JUNIUS AND *BURKE.*

SIR, *Jan.* 1801.

YOUR having, ſome time ago, entered into an inquiry concerning the author of the Letters of Junius, I thought the following account might not be unacceptable to you. I, therefore, take the liberty to ſend it you, for your private ſatisfaction. You may, however, make what uſe of it you pleaſe.

I am, Sir, your conſtant reader,
And moſt humble ſervant,
A. B.

THE more attentively I conſider the remarkable phraſeology of the three following extracts (ſo remarkable, in my opinion, that I much queſtion, whether any thing ſimilar to it is to be found in any other publication *), and the reſemblance in the general air and manner of ſtyle between the whole of the three paragraphs, the more I ſeem to be convinced they proceed from the ſame pen. I have, however, no doubt, but this piece of criticiſm may be thought by ſome to be vague and futile; and enough may be ſaid againſt the poor critic, who could be vain enough to flatter himſelf with having diſcovered a ſecret of ſuch magnitude, after ſo many years concealment and ſo much inquiry, by means ſeemingly ſo trivial—one ſolitary internal proof. But before the laugh is carried too far againſt him, he hopes the laugher will call to mind the old Latin proverb—*Ex pede Herculem.*

" From whatever origin your influence in this country ariſes, it

---

* I confeſs, that it is on this circumſtance the ſtrength of my argument chiefly reſts.

is

is a phenomenon inthe hiſtory of human virtue and underſtanding *Goo men* can hardly believe the fact: *wiſe men* are unable to account for it: *religious men* find exerciſe for their faith; and make it the laſt effort of their piety not to repine againſt Providence."

Junius's Letter to the D. of Grafton, Vol. ii. l. 51.

"Every project of a material change in a government ſo complicated as our's; combined at the ſame time with external circumſtances ſtill more complicated, is a matter full of difficulty; in which a *conſiderate man* will not be too ready to decide: *a prudent man* too ready to undertake: or an honeſt man too ready to promiſe."

Thoughts on the Cauſe of our preſent Diſcontents, p. 99, 3d edit.

"I really think for *wiſe men* this is not judicious: for *ſober men* not decent: for *minds tinctured with humanity*, not mild and merciful." Mr. Burke's Speech, March 22, 1777, p. 49. 3d edit.

N. B. The punctuation is exactly conformable to the originals. I mention this circumſtance with a particular view to the colons in each of the three extracts. This remark will, probably, appear to you, Mr. Editor, very trifling, and of no weight in confirmation of what I had ſaid before. Indeed, I lay very little ſtreſs upon it myſelf. But I thought there would be no harm juſt to mention it.

P. S. A Mr. Dyer, boſom friend of the orator in queſtion, dies, Junius dies with him. Mr. Dyer was, therefore, the author of the Letters of Junius. Not quite that. He was not the author; but there are ſtrong reaſons for believing he was a great help-mate to the author, and the manager for him, reſpecting the printing theſe letters, &c.

The writer of the above was, with five or ſix more, at ſupper in a houſe in Leiceſter-fields, when Mr. B. came into the parlour. He told us, with great emotion and concern (his eyes full of tears), that Dyer was dead. He then took a paper out of his pocket (which was handed round the table *), containing a character of his deceaſed friend, which he ſaid he intended to get inſerted in the public prints.

VERAX.

* This was occaſioned by Mr. Burke's wanting a word in exchange for one he had wrote, which he diſliked. One of our company hit upon one, which Mr. B. adopted.

THE NEW CENTURY.

SIR,

I AM very ſenſible, that what I am now going to offer is contrary to the general opinion, particularly to that of the celebrated aſtronomer, La Lande. This makes me ſtrongly ſuſpect, that I am miſtaken; although I cannot diſcover where the miſtake lies. And this, on the other hand, tempts me to venture my troubling you with it, truſting to your candour, in caſe my ſuſpicion ſhould be juſt. Yours, &c.

A. B.

AN argument tending to prove, that the year when firſt dated

on the 1ſt of January is then complete; that it is a cardinal, not an ordinal, number. To prove this, I obſerve, that the Golden Number is a Cycle of 19 years *complete*. Now in order to find the Golden Number for any year, the rule is, to divide that year by 19—the remainder is the Golden number, which is the number of years *complete* ſince the beginning of the then current Cycle. For example—To find the Golden Number for the preſent dated year 1801, 1 is firſt to be added to it,* which makes 1802; which divided by 19, thus—

19 | 1802 | 94 Cycles ſince the beginning of
171 the year preceding the birth
——— of our Saviour.

92
76

16 years complete ſince the beginning of the preſent current Cycle.

Now, I ſay that the above dividend is 1802 years *complete* ſince the beginning of the Cycle current at the time of the birth of our Saviour; and 1801 years *complete* ſince that event, and ſurely, to ſuppoſe the dividend an ordinal, when it cannot be denied, that the diviſor is a cardinal number, appears to me, I confeſs, very much like an abſurdity.

P. S. Three years complete from the 1ſt of this month January (1801) will be January the 1ſt, 1804; at which period the preſent current Cycle of 19 years will terminate. This will make 95 Cycles, or 1805 years complete ſince the beginning of that Cycle, which was current at the time of the Nativity, and, conſequently, 1804 years complete ſince the beginning of the Chriſtian æra. This appears to me a demonſtration, that the year, when firſt dated on the 1ſt of January, is then complete. It is, indeed, the dated but not the current year.

* This is done on account of the Cycle, current at the time of the Nativity, beginning firſt one year before that event.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

HAVING taken in your Review from its firſt eſtabliſhment, I may, perhaps, be allowed to claim the privilege which I every month ſee exerciſed by others, (who do not think with us on the great points of religion and politics,) of ſoliciting information from yourſelf, Sir, or ſome of your correſpondents. The ſubject of my enquiry is of importance; it is one, which at this moment, is the cauſe of much feveriſh irritation in the country, and to which if any regard be paid to the feelings of the inhabitants of the diſtant counties, attention muſt, and ought to be given by high authority.

I am, Sir, a plain unlettered country gentleman, of ſmall fortune, and, conſtantly reſident in a retired village of one of the midland counties; and, from being the only inhabitant of the pariſh above the

rank

rank of a ſmall farmer, ſmall I mean compared to the great ones with which this country is now infeſted, am frequently referred to for information by my neighbours on matters which fall not immediately within their means of accurate knowledge; and, perhaps, you will give me credit when I aſſert it, that I am highly delighted when I am able to ſatisfy them, and to ſatisfy myſelf, in the explanation I may have it in my power to give them.

I would not have ſaid thus much of *myſelf*, had it not been neceſſary that you ſhould keep conſtantly in mind, that, from a man ſo circumſtanced, and ſo ſituated, you are not to expect great vigour of conception, or, what is now more generally acceptable, great elegance of expreſſion; but, that if you honour me with a page in your work, you muſt reſt ſatisfied with the plain thoughts of a plain man, endeavoured to be given in a plain manner. Thus much by way of preface; now to my point.

We are weekly, nay daily, informed of the immenſe importation of all ſorts of grain in "the river." I ſuppoſe the Thames is meant by this expreſſion; all this is well; but we are alſo informed that this grain is permitted to remain, (nay worſe than permitted, abſolutely *detained*) there, until it becomes unfit for food, and that it is, in an actual ſtate of putrefaction; thrown into "the river," and not brought to market for fear of a too rapid diminution of the prices. It is alſo aſſerted, that before this nefarious operation of injection takes place, this grain has been regularly entered at the cuſtom-houſe, and has actually received the bounty for importation; and thus is the country plundered of its money, and what is an additional grievance defrauded of that bread, for the arrival of which it *has* been, or *is* to be, extraordinarily taxed, and is ſtill left to the mercy and conſcience of commercial ſpeculators!! On this ſubject of the arrival, and deſtruction of grain, I have been more than once almoſt "put to the queſtion," and really have not been able to give any ſatisfactory anſwer. My enquiries hitherto have only produced accounts various and contradictory; ſome times, and with the appearance of authority, the fact has been abſolutely denied, and as often times as ſtrenuouſly ſupported. In this "conflict of opinions," as Johnſon called it, "I do (not) delight," I wiſh the truths to be aſcertained, and made public. The feelings of the country ſhould not be outraged. You muſt be ſenſible, Sir, that the prevalence of ſuch an opinion may be productive of the moſt calamitous conſequences; and if you or any of your correſpondents are enabled to contradict it, for the ſake of the community, I entreat you, or them to do it; I will not ſay that Jacobins *only* aſſert the fact, but I will ſay that it is the part of Anti-Jacobins to diſprove it.

I have not at this moment leiſure to ſay more on the ſubject; but in a future Number if you think me worth your attention, I mean to intrude upon you my thoughts on ſome other ſubjects, not altogether inconſiſtent with the deſign of your work, particularly the cauſes, and *probable* effects of the preſent ſcarcity; and among the latter, to conſider the extravagant and ill-judged relief *in money*, which almoſt every complainant at this time obtains from the provincial magiſtracy.

Jan. 18, 1801. ETHELBERT.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

SANCTIONED by a motto which adorns moſt Courts of Juſtice, viz. "*Audi alteram Partem*," there requires no apology for intruding the preſent ſubject on your notice. Obſerving in your Number of laſt month a letter under the ſignature of "MOSES GREENSOD" (by the bye a very applicable name) in which he affects to be wonderfully ſurpriſed at his wife's not being able to *purchaſe* a prayer book at a circulating library, I muſt confeſs myſelf ſomewhat aſtoniſhed at the illiberality of the writer, in endeavouring to attach a ſtigma, wholly unmerited, on one of the moſt reſpectable, and at the ſame time deſirable, inſtitutions in the metropolis.—The reply of the "*Shopman*" that they "*never kept ſuch books*," was perfectly correct, and I will venture to aſſert, there is not a circulating library in London that does keep ſuch books—in the firſt place, circulating libraries have nothing to do with ſelling of books; and ſecondly, it is to be hoped, that notwithſtanding Mr. Moſes Greenſod's "*fright*" at the "*ſad change in the times*," all families are in poſſeſſion of at leaſt a prayer book, if not a bible, without applying to a circulating library for the peruſal of a book which every body is ſuppoſed to know by rote.

In order to quiet Mrs. Greenſod's apprehenſions as to the "*ſad change in the times*," permit me to obſerve that the very houſe at which ſhe ſo "*involuntarily threw her eyes upwards*," is poſſeſſed, for the diffuſion of religion and morality, of a collection of books in divinity that would form a very complete library of itſelf; and whenever Mr. Greenſod can ſpare an hour from "*meaſuring a yard of tape*" it will be found alſo that the ſame houſe can furniſh him with the WHOLE DUTY OF MAN, wherein he will learn that CANDOR TOWARDS OUR NEIGHBOUR is ſtrongly urged among the ſalutary doctrines which it enforces.

A particular ſtreſs appears to have been laid upon the *manner* in which the anſwer by the "*Shopman*" was conveyed—perhaps this lady, piqued at the trouble in applying to ſeveral ſhops in vain, to meet with a type ſuited to her infirmities, converted the features of civility into the outlines of contempt, and the language of complaiſance into the tone of deriſion. I ſhould be ſorry to rate Mr. Greenſod among that order of beings who

> *Traduce by cuſtom, as moſt dogs do bark;*
> *Do nothing out of judgment, but diſeaſe;*
> *Speak ill, becauſe they never could ſpeak well:*

I would, however, adviſe him in future to inveſtigate before he writes, and to feel convinced ere he decides.

London, 25th Feb. 1801. PHILALETHES.

I cannot diſmiſs this letter without expreſſing the ſatisfaction I have frequently derived in contemplating your unvaried exertions in the cauſe of religion.—May thoſe exertions be perpetuated; may you ſtill continue to promulgate thoſe doctrines which aid the cauſe of Chriſtianity, by promoting a ſpirit of virtuous emulation, and inculcating the precepts of morality in the minds of your countrymen.

NORDEN'S PROPHECY.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR

IN your critique on "Citizen Ripaud's Report of the Commiſſion of fine Arts," you ſay, P. 274, November, 1800, "we think that he has treated Norden with too much ſeverity, and, indeed, with injuſtice." In reading, lately, "Obſervations on divers Paſſages of Scripture," publiſhed in 1764 anonymouſly, but ſince known to be written by Harmer, I found (P. 444.) a reference to "Norden's Travels in Egypt," publiſhed by Templeman, 1757, P. 150, Vol. II. in which a Mahometan Prophecy ſeemsto bear ſome reſemblance to that of Fleming, which has been lately brought forward to public notice.

"The Cacheff ſaid—"I know already what ſort of people you are; I have conſulted my cup, and have found out by it, that you are thoſe, of whom one of our prophets has ſaid that there would come Franks in diſguiſe, who, by little preſents, and by ſoothing and inſinuating behaviour, would paſs every where, examine the ſtate of the country, go afterwards to make a report of it, and bring at laſt a great number of other Franks, who would conquer the country, and exterminate all."

If this ſhould be applicable to Meſſrs. Savary, Volney, and Co. perhaps Citizen Ripaud may have had his reaſons for not being partial to Norden.

CHURCH MUSIC.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

HAVING obſerved the unmeaning, if not profane, way in which the organiſts of our churches and chapels generally perform their duty, I trouble you with a few lines to ſuggeſt a regulation which might be attended, I think, with uſeful conſequences; I mean, that *ſet pieces of Church Muſic ſhould be printed by authority of Parliament.* Were this the caſe, the organ might aſſiſt to liſt our minds up to God, inſtead of bringing to them the recollection of dances and ballads. I am, Sir, your humble ſervant,

Feb. 14, 1801. D.

The thought of the two Tears in Mr. REYNOLDS'S COMEDY *reminds us of two MS. Stanzas which are not leſs elegant.*

CUPID in ſport a dart had thrown,
Which hit by chance his mother's breaſt;
He heard her ſigh in piteous moan;
He caught her weeping and diſtreſs'd.

She dropt a tear upon his hand—
He dropt one too, by pity guided—
They mix'd—and ſince we underſtand,
Love and *diſtreſs* are ne'er divided.

HISTORY.

HISTORY.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

MELANCHOLY and painful as the taſk of recording paſſing events has frequently been, ſince the firſt commencement of our labours; full-fraught, as the times unqueſtionably are, with occurrences of importance, almoſt unprecedented, to the preſent well-being and future exiſtence of mankind; yet, compared with the circumſtances of the moment, in this kingdom, they loſe much of their relative conſequence, and our concern for the calamities with which Europe in general is afflicted, is almoſt loſt in the diſmal apprehenſions which the peculiar ſituation of our own country is calculated to excite. Sceptical and incredulous, indeed, muſt he be who can withhold his belief from the manifeſt interpoſition of the Deity to produce this ſtrange, this unlooked-for, this unnatural ſtate of things; a ſtate of things, which baffles all the vain ſpeculations of human foreſight, and ſets at nought all the confident predictions of human wiſdom. The ability to connect cauſe with effect, in the ordinary occurrences of common life, is alone requiſite to diſcover *ſin* and *puniſhment*, in theſe moſt awful inflictions of Divine Providence. To what other ſource, indeed, were it poſſible to trace that waywardneſs of mind, which, on the one hand, has engendered the diſpoſition to treat friendſhip as enmity, and to embrace enmity as kindneſs; and, on the other, has operated, like a temporary blindneſs obſcuring the moſt acute and the moſt ſound judgment, perverting the moſt ſplendid, and the moſt ſolid abilities, and counteracting the moſt virtuous and moſt honourable principles, and ſo ſtimulating the moſt upright and beſt-intentioned patriots to the commiſſion of an act of political ſuicide? Thus we behold ourſelves, at once, threatened with a hoſtile combination of all the naval, and nearly all the military, force of Europe, a combination alike without example and without excuſe, unprincipled in its motive and criminal in its object; and with a dreadful ſchiſm in our own councils.

Our high opinion of Mr. PITT, the eſtimation in which we hold his talents and integrity, the gratitude which we feel towards him, for his eminent public ſervices, and particularly for his ſucceſsful efforts to ſtem the torrent of Jacobiniſm at home, and his laudable, though ineffectual, exertions to arreſt its progreſs abroad, have been too ſtrongly, and too repeatedly, avowed by us, to admit of a doubt at the preſent moment. For EARL SPENCER, Mr. WINDHAM and the other noblemen and gentlemen, who have participated in his labours and ſupported him in his principles, we feel the ſame ſentiments of eſteem and gratitude. The feeble aſſiſtance which we have been enabled to afford them, in extending the propagation of thoſe principles, has been given, with ſincerity and zeal, from a high and predominant ſenſe of duty to our country. It is that ſame ſenſe of duty which now leads us to deplore, moſt deeply, the reſignation of their reſpective offices and the conſequent loſs of their ſervices in the cabinet, and, at the ſame time, to deprecate, moſt ſtrongly, the adoption of thoſe meaſures, the rejection of which, by their Sovereign, occaſioned that reſignation. The firſt of theſe meaſures was the re-

peal

peal of all the penal ſtatutes, that ſtill remain in force againſt the Roman Catholics, which would place them on the ſame footing as the members of the eſtabliſhed church; the ſecond was the repeal of the teſt and corporation acts; which would, indeed, be a neceſſary conſequence of the firſt, as it would ſcarcely be poſſible, after opening the doors of power and of parliament to the Roman Catholics, to ſhut them againſt other Diſſenters, of whatever denomination. Our readers cannot have forgotten the repeated declarations, which we have had occaſion to make, of our ſentiments on theſe two grand queſtions. We have long conſidered them, attentively and deeply, and the reſult of that conſideration has been a firm conviction in our minds, that the almoſt unavoidable conſequence of their adoption, would be the abſolute ſubverſion of the conſtituted order of things in Church and State. It is not, then, in times like theſe, which put men's principles to the teſt, that we are diſpoſed to ſhrink from the duty, which impels every honeſt man to proportion his efforts to the exigences of the moment; all our feeble powers ſhall be exerted in reſiſtance of meaſures which, to us, appear pregnant with the moſt deſtructive effects to that conſtitution which we ſtand ſo ſolemnly pledged to ſupport.

We ſhall not here enter into any enquiry reſpecting the nature of the *pledge* which has been ſaid to have been exacted by the friends of the Union in Ireland, as the condition of their ſupport, and the anxiety to redeem which was the alledged cauſe of the reſignation of Mr. Pitt. We ſhall, no doubt, have frequent opportunities, in the diſcharge of our duty as Critics, of fully diſcuſſing that ſubject. In the mean time, it is ſufficient for us to know, and we ſtate the fact with confidence, in order to remove ſome very falſe impreſſions which have been made on the public mind by a different ſtatement, that the KING never gave his cabinet miniſters the ſmalleſt reaſon to believe that the meaſures in queſtion would have his ſanction and ſupport;—on the contrary, *nearly three years ago*, his MAJESTY declared his firm reſolution never to give his conſent to acts, which conſent his ſenſe and his conſcience told him would involve a violation of his coronation oath. To this muſt be imputed the memorable recal of EARL FITZWILLIAMS; and to this muſt be aſcribed his firmneſs in rejecting the propoſitions, and reſiſting the perſuaſions, of his late Miniſters. It is indeed, to us a matter of extreme ſurprize, that, under ſuch circumſtances, thoſe Miniſters ſhould have ventured to give a pledge in the firſt inſtance, and afterwards, for the purpoſe of redeeming it, to introduce the ſubject of it into his Majeſty's Speech. The reception which ſuch a propoſition experienced was ſuch as ſurely *they* had good reaſon to expect; and his Majeſty's explanation, when they foretold the conſequences which would reſult from his refuſal, FIAT JUSTITIA, RUAT CŒLUM! was ſuch as, moſt undoubtedly, *we* ſhould have expected from a previous knowledge of his ſentiments and his character. His MAJESTY's conduct, and it is important to have it clearly underſtood, has been ſteady, uniform, conſiſtent, and deciſive; and he has, in all reſpects, proved himſelf truly worthy of the honourable title which he enjoys, *Of the united Church of England and Ireland on earth ſupreme head.*

An

An attempt has been made by a reſpectable catholic, Mr. Butler, (a gentleman who has, we believe, acted, more than once, as agent for the Catholics,) the fallacy of which we have expoſed in the critical department of this number, to perſuade the public that the coronation oath can be no poſſible bar to the king's acquieſcence in the meaſures propoſed; but, thank heaven! Mr, Butler is not the keeper of his Majeſty's conſcience, whoever may be the keeper of his own; and unleſs he have the ability to *prove*, (not merely to *aſſert*) that the eſtabliſhed church of theſe realms would not be endangered by the adoption of ſuch meaſures, all his arguments will be nugatory. We have never been deemed adverſe to the Roman Catholics; we have, indeed, been accuſed, by the Methodiſts, of being favourably inclined to their principles; but the truth is, as our readers will eaſily believe, that we are decidedly adverſe to ſome of the fundamental articles of their faith, and very favourably diſpoſed towards themſelves. We wiſh them, therefore, to enjoy all the advantages of *toleration*, in its fulleſt extent, and to grant them every indulgence which is compatible with the ſafety of the eſtabliſhment; but, when an attempt is made to remove the line of diſtinction between *toleration* and *encouragement*; when, not contented with demanding as a *right* that which they have hitherto received as an *indulgence*, they aſpire to graſp the reins of government, and to acquire that conſequence and power, which lead, by a ſlow but certain progreſs, to *aſcendancy* and *command*, duty and inclination combine in oppoſition to an endeavour, hte ſucceſs of which would, we are convinced, prove the ruin of that eſtabliſhment.

In the fifth volume of our work (Pp. 67, 68) we aſſigned ſome ſtrong reaſons in ſupport of our opinions on this important topic; but, inſtead, of refering our readers to the paſſage, we ſhall briefly recapitulate them. Doctor Troy, the Romiſh Archbiſhop of Dublin, and, of courſe, a man of weight and authority with perſons of his own perſuaſion, and, be it obſerved, deriving his power immediately from the Pope, publiſhed, in the year 1793, a paſtoral letter, the object of which was to demonſtrate the nature of the Papal ſupremacy, and to ſhew, that all Roman Catholics were bound to pay implicit obedience to the authority of general councils. The following is an extract from that letter.

'It is a *fundamental article* of the Roman Catholic faith, that the Pope or Biſhop of Rome is ſucceſſor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apoſtles, in that See; he enjoys by divine right a ſpiritual and eccleſiaſtical primacy, not only of honour and rank, but of *real juriſdiction and authority*, in the univerſal church. Roman Catholics conceive this point as clearly eſtabliſhed in the ſcriptures, and by the conſtant tradition of the Fathers in every age, as it is by the *expreſs deciſions of their general councils, which they conſider as infallible authority in points of doctrine.*'

It being thus clearly proved, by competent authority, which has never yet been queſtioned or impeached, though *the letter* has been publiſhed more than ſeven years, that the Roman Catholics are bound to abide by the deciſions of General Councils, we ſhall now give an extract from the fourth Council of Lateran, which was holden in 1215, and is ſtill in force, becauſe its decrees have never

been

been revoked; nor indeed, are they susceptible of revocation, for every one knows that the *Romish Church is infallible.*

'Let all secular powers, whatsoever be the nature and rank of their respective offices, be admonished, persuaded, and, if necessary, *compelled*, by ecclesiastical censures, that as they desire to be reputed and esteemed faithful, they publicly take an oath, that they will, to the utmost of their power, endeavour *to exterminate* all such as shall be denounced heretics by the church, out of all their dominions and places subject to their jurisdiction; and let them take this oath respectively, the moment they shall be invested with either spiritual or temporal power.

'But if any temporal Lord shall neglect to purge his dominions of such heritical corruption, after being required and admonished by the Church, by his Metropolitans and his other provincial Bishops so to do, *let him be immediately bound in the chains of excommunication*; and if he shall contumaciously refuse to make satisfaction and submit himself to the Church within the year, *let this be signified to the Pope, who shall thereupon declare his subjects absolved from their allegiance, and proclaim his territories open to the just seizure and occupation of Catholic Powers, who, after they shall have exterminated the heretics, shall possess them without control, and preserve them in the purity of the faith still preserving the title of the principal Lord, provided he shall give them no interruption, or oppose any impediment to their proceedings*; and let the same rule be observed with respect to those who have no principal lords, *i. e.* republics.

'Let all Catholics who shall undertake a *crusade* for the extermination of heretics have the same indulgence, and the same holy privilege, as those who undertake the crusade for the expulsion of the infidels from the holy land.

'We decree, that not only those who profess heretical tenets, but all receivers, protectors, and favourers of heretics, are *ipso facto* excommunicated; and we strictly ordain and command, that after any such shall be publicly branded with excommunication, if they shall refuse to make satisfaction, and submit themselves to the Church within a year, *they shall be infamous, nor shall they be admitted to any public office or council, nor to elect any persons to such, nor to give testimony in any cause: neither shall they be capable of making wills, nor of succession, as heirs or representatives, to any estate: they shall be incapable of suing in any court, but may themselves be sued: if any such person shall happen to be a judge of any court, his sentence shall be null and void, nor shall any cause be prosecuted before him: if he shall happen to be an advocate, he shall not be admitted to practise; if a notary, instruments drawn up, prepared, witnessed, or executed by him, shall also be void and of no effect, but condemned with their guilty framer: and we command that the same rule be observed in all similar cases.* But if he be a clergyman, let him be deposed both *ab officio et beneficio*, that as his crime is the greater, so the greater may be his punishment.'

We shall next state the oath still invariably taken by a Roman Catholic Bishop, with a view to prove that the same *spirit* which prevailed in this Council respecting *Heretics* subsists in its full vigour, at the present time.

'I, ——, Bishop of ———, do swear, that from this hour forward I shall be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, and to the holy

Church.

Church of Rome, *and to my Lord the Pope and his successors canonically entering*. I shall not be of counsel nor consent that they shall lose either life or member, or shall be taken or suffer any violence or any wrong by any means. Their counsel to me credited by them, their messages or letters I shall not willingly discover to any person. The Papacy of Rome, the rules of the holy Fathers, and the *regality* of St. Peter, I shall help, maintain, and defend against all men. The Legate of the See apostolic, going and coming, I shall honourably entreat: the rights, honours, privileges, and authorities of the Church of Rome, and the Pope and his successors, I shall cause to be conserved, defended, *augmented and promoted*. I shall not be in council, treaty, or any act, in which any thing shall be imagined against him or the Church of Rome, their rights, seats, honours, or powers; and if I know any such to be moved or compassed, I shall resist it to my power; and as soon as I can I shall advertise him, or such as may give him knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the decrees, ordinances, sentences, dispostions, reservations, provisions, and commandments apostolic, to my power I shall keep, and cause to be kept of others. *Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our holy Father and his successors, I shall resist and persecute to my power*. I shall come to the synod when I am called, except I be letted by a canonical impediment. The thresholds of the aposles I shall visit yearly, personally or by my deputy. I shall not alienate or sell my possessions without the Pope's counsel. So help me God and the holy Evangelists.'

It remains for the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland (not individually but collectively) formally, by a public act, to renounce the authority by which one of their Bishops has declared them to be bound, or else they must cease to pretend that a compliance with their claims is compatible with the coronation-oath, or consistent with the safety of the constitution of these realms.

But the propoſed repeal of the penal ſtatutes, we have reaſon to fear, only formed a part of the ſyſtem which *ſome*, at leaſt, of the late Miniſters intended to purſue. In the preface to the fifth volume of our work, our readers will recollect, that we offered a ſolemn admonition to the Clergy of the Eſtabliſhed Church, recalling to their minds the ſalutary adage "*principiis obſta*," and warning them "that their enemies were indefatigable in their exertions to undermine the eſtabliſhment, and that the defeat of every effort for this purpoſe, *from whatever quarter it might proceed*, depended eſpecially, if not ſolely, upon themſelves." It is now time to *ſpeak out*, and to declare, that we then alluded to a plan which we knew to be in agitation, for the abolition, or commutation of tythes. This plan the late Miniſter, impoſed upon no doubt by the ſpecious arguments of certain ſectaries, who pretended to ſupport him on the moſt diſintereſted principles, though it might eaſily be proved that they were the moſt intereſted of men, ſanctioned with his approbation, and even, we believe, laid it before his Majeſty, who, actuated by one uniform principle of attachment to the Eſtabliſhed Church, of which he was the ſworn guardian and protector, moſt properly referred him to the Prelates of that Church, whom the adviſers of the premier had not thought it neceſſary to conſult!—We know

full

full well, that among the Miniſters who have reſigned, there are ſome who would have condemned this dreadful inroad upon ſacred property, this unaccountable imitation of French revolutionary practices, this formidable attack upon the conſtituted order of our eccleſiaſtical polity, with as much warmth and deciſion as ourſelves. But that repeal which they meditated, in conjunction with their aſſociates, would naturally, and almoſt neceſſarily, have led to this meaſure; and the principle of innovation being once admitted, it would have been as difficult as uſeleſs to reſiſt the application of it, or the inferences which might be fairly deduced from it.

We ſhall, for the preſent, quit this unpleaſant ſubject, upon which volumes might be written; but we deemed it our duty to ſay thus much, in order to put men on their guard, and to induce the well diſpoſed members of both Houſes of Parliament, (who we are willing to believe conſtitute a very large majority) to inveſtigate deeply this moſt important topic of diſcuſſion, and to pauſe before they give a vote, which may prove deciſive of their country's fate.

We are conſcious, that, by the part whichwe take on theſe great queſtions, we ſhall incur the enmity of men, with whoſe friendſhip, at preſent, we are honoured, and the continuance of whoſe good opinion, intereſt and inclination, would prompt us to ſecure; but among theſe are ſome, we know, whoſe high and honourable minds will give us that credit which we give to them, for the ſincerity of their zeal, and the purity of their intentions, even on points on which we differ moſt eſſentially from them. At all events, our option between principle and intereſt has long ſince been made, without heſitation as without regret, and we ſhall invariably endeavour to diſcharge, to the utmoſt of our ability, that paramount duty which we owe to our King, our Country, and our GOD.

On the Continent, ſuch a peace has been ſigned between the Emperor and the French Republic, as we predicted; with this only difference, that the fortreſſes of *Mentz* and *Ehreinbreitſtein* are reſerved as objects of future regulation. The Germanic Conſtitution is virtually diſſolved; and the French have taken thoſe boundaries which the *patriots* of 1792 aſſigned as the *natural* limits of the Republic. In ſhort, from the banks of the Adige to thoſe of the Scheldt, their power is unlimited; while they enjoy an extent of ſea coaſt, reaching from the Adriatic Gulph to the German Ocean, with the power, by the poſſeſſion of all the fortreſſes on the frontiers of their immenſe territory, to extend their empire whenever they pleaſe. All the plans which we aſcribed to them, in the preface to our laſt Volume*, are now clearly developed; and their arts being as ſucceſsful as their arms, they have ſucceeded in combining againſt usall the maritime powers of Europe, whoſe threats and efforts, if united among ourſelves, we might regard with equal contempt. The treaty, which we ſuppoſed to be in agitation, between the Quixotic Emperor of Ruſſia and the Firſt Conſul of France, has been concluded; and, as we foretold, preparations are making for a ſpeedy invaſion of the Turkiſh dominions.

* Publiſhed in the Appendix on the 1ſt of February.

All

All theſe events have afforded ample materials for adulatory addreſſes, (in which *Republicans* are known to excel) from the different public bodies to the Corſican uſurper, replete with threats of vengeance againſt this country, which has the daring preſumption to reſiſt his will, and to withſtand his power. The language which they employ is certainly conſiſtent and appropriate, for it is the language of *ſlaves* to a *tyrant*.

In this ſtate of things, with a hoſt of enemies to encounter, we have only to remain true to ourſelves, and to exert thoſe energies and thoſe reſources which Providence has graciouſly ſuffered us ſtill to retain, in defence of our liberties, our independence, and our religion. Of the iſſue of ſuch a conteſt, conducted under ſuch auſpices, *we* ſhould not entertain a doubt. Moſt happily the new Miniſters, whom his Majeſty has called to his councils, are men of ſound principles, ardent zeal, unblemiſhed characters, and ſolid abilities; and it is with infinite ſatisfaction that we witneſs the laudable reſolution of the Noble Duke, who has preſided over the home department of the ſtate, with ſo much honour to himſelf, and ſo much advantage to the country, to retain his important ſituation, and adhere to his Sovereign, in the glorious ſtand which he now makes in defence of the Eſtabliſhed Church†. There can be no doubt that the country will rally round ſuch an Adminiſtration, and give them the moſt decided countenance and ſupport.

† The diviſion in the Cabinet, on the propoſition for ſupporting the repeal of the Penal and Teſt Laws againſt Catholics and Diſſenters, we underſtand to have been *ſix*, in favour of the meaſure, and *five* againſt it.

TO CORRESPONDENT.

"A METHODIST" who dates his letter from *Lancaſhire*, accuſes us of *intolerance* and *perſecution*, and affirms that we are "*men hoſtile to religious liberty, and conſequently, to the Britiſh conſtitution*;" and that "the Methodiſts have been long known and acknowledged loyal."—We ſhall make no defence againſt the charge of *hoſtility*; and, by way of anſwer to the praiſe of himſelf and his aſſociates, we requeſt this "Methodiſt" to read *Mr. John Pawſon's Sermons*, and *Mr. Polwhele's Anecdotes*.

"*Unus Solus*" may be aſſured that he can make us *feel* nothing but the moſt ſovereign contempt for him and his productions. Ignorance and vanity are fit companions for each other.

A reſpectable correſpondent, at the *Hot-wells*, is informed that we have received letters of various deſcriptions, *impudent*, *obſcene*, *treaſonable*, and *blaſphemous*, all of which we have been *dared* to publiſh. We ſuſpect that the one to which *he* alludes is noticed above.—The writers of ſuch letters are deceived in their expectations; for they are regularly returned to the Poſt-office, and the poſtage is reimburſed.

Pater's note is tranſmitted to the gentleman who reviewed the article to which he adverts.

C. I. by referring to the *Appendix* to our ſeventh volume, will find that we have no intention of "diſcontinuing the Monthly Summary of Politics;" though it be not our intention to offer *reflections* without *facts*; and it is not in our power to enſure a regular ſupply of *facts*.

C. C. C. C. is received.

"*The Viſion of Liberty*" is intended for inſertion in our next Number.

The blaſphemous rant of "a Deiſt" has nothing to recommend it but its blaſphemy, which is no recommendation to us.

The farther communications of our eſtimable correſpondent, "*Academicus*" will meet with that preference and attention to which they are ſo eminently entitled.